

DELUSIONS OF

ARUN SHOURIE

A Futile Attempt
of an iconoclast

**VASANT
MOON**

DELUSIONS OF ARUN SHOURIE

*A Futile attempt of icon breaking
of an iconoclast*

VASANT MOON



- ❑ Published by - Vasant Moon
Y-6/90 Govt. Colony,
Bandra (East)
Mumbai - 400051.
- ❑ © - Nalanda Charitable Trust,
447, Hanuman Nagar,
Nagpur - 9
- ❑ Cover Page - Bali Khaire, Yavatmal
- ❑ Cover Page Print at - Yash Prints, Nagpur
- ❑ Typesetting at - Sri Sai Computers, Yavatmal
- ❑ Printed at - Shreekripa Enterprises,
Yavatmal
- ❑ Publishing - 14th Nov. 1997, Yavatmal
- ❑ Price - Rs. 100/-

❑ **DELUSIONS OF ARUN SHOURIE -**

A Futile attempt of icon breaking of an iconoclast

- Vasant Moon

Dedicated to

- *The Bharatratna*
- *The Patriot*
- *The Principal Architect of the
Constitution of India.*
- *The Crusader Against Social
Inequalities & Injustices.*

..... Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar

ON THE GOLDEN EVE of
50TH
ANNIVERSARY of INDEPENDENCE
of India

FOREWARDS

Aim of this book is not to defend Dr. Ambedkar. He is the brightest star shining in the Galaxy of Indian Heros. He does not need any defence and the efforts of ill minded people cannot tarnish him, cannot at any cost.

Aim of this book is not to convince Arun Shourie. He is a victim of paranoid delusions and there is no fun in convincing him. This book is written for those readers, who have accidentally read Arun Shourie's 'Worshipping False Gods.' Before they form any opinion about Dr. Ambedkar, based on malafied writings of Shourie, readers are requested to research the validity of his 'research'. I am sure this book would bring forward the distorted, deviated and prejudiced information presented by Shourie.

With collapse of Marxism in Russia, with experience of Liberty without equality in developed countries, scholars from various parts of the world started studying the philosophy & thoughts of Dr. Ambedkar. Govt. of Maharashtra published the treasure of his writings & speeches in 16 volumes. This left no alternative for fanatic and orthodox people, but to finish his thoughts. This is the real genesis behind Shourie's book.

It is sure that Shourie's 'wild goose chase' of setting 'Thames on fire' would prove to be a mare's nest at last. A 638 paged book packed with references has been drudged on readers. Shourie has adopted Gobels strategy of harping on the same string.

Many writers have analysed Shourie's writing critically in News Papers articles, chiefly Dr. Y.D. Fadke, Govinda Talwalkar, Mr. V.N. Gadgil, Dr. Jyoti Lanjewar, Shreepad Joshi are few to name. Considering the limitations of News papers and considering the target readers - for whom Shourie has written his book - I had to give my expression in a book form in English Language. This helped me to concentrate on issues like "Deliverance Day", "Minority Pact", "Poona - Pact" and tear the mask of writer, to expose Mr. Hyde in the face of Dr. Jekyll.

To appreciate the height of thoughts of Dr. Ambedkar one has to have certain level of understanding. One has to take into account facts & situations in past history. Without this real image of Dr. Ambedkar cannot be understood. Shourie who has lost the property of proper thinking how can he judge Dr. Ambedkar correctly ?

I pray for such souls.

"Oh Lord !..... Please forgive him. He does not know that he is writing. He doesnot know what he is doing. He is not responsible for his activities. Please forgive him."

My thanks one due, to all those, who helped me directly or indirectly in writing this Book. Mr. M.M. Narwade, Mr. Sagar Jadhao, Mr. Bali Khaire & Mr. Sunil Wakode are few to mention. Mr. Ajay Bhalerao, Miss. Kalpana Lokhande of Shreekripa Enterprises took keen & personal interest in Designing and printing of this book.

● Vasant Moon

BACK - GROUND

If one wants to understand Dr. Ambedkar, why he behaved in a particular situation in a particular way; if one wants to understand his hatred for caste system, it is necessary to understand his early life and his depressed class society. Because this was the time which sowed the seeds of hatred against Casteism and inequalities in society, in Ambedkar's mind. This would also give us an opportunity to peep into the life of untouchables, as to what type of life they were leading and slavery they were facing.

Born on April 14, 1891 in a 'Mahar' family of untouchable Hindu, Ambedkar's first name was Bhim Sakpal. He was intelligent, sensitive and talented. His father Ramji Sakpal had fourteen children. His mother Bhimabai, a pious and gentle woman was self respecting. Ramji a garrulous person, famed for his sincerity and orthodoxy was unflinchingly devoted to god. Bhimabai came from a family that belonged to kabir cult. The mother died when Bhim was only six years old. Bhim was looked after by Mirabai, Ramji's sister and by his own sister.¹

Bhim received his primary education at Satara after which he was admitted to a High school along with his elder brother. Even as a school student he had to face many injustices and indignities on account of he being untouchable and made him to realise how hateful the Caste system was. He recalled in later years how a caste Hindu cartman, realising

1. Narration from '*Preface to Ambedkarism*' by R.C. Prasad P- 23-56.

that he was accursed untouchable had thrown him and his brother, out on the road, in a fit of rage on their way to Goregaon, where his father worked. The cartman, though ignorant of Shastras, had inherited the belief that by touching an untouchable one gets polluted. When he threw the boys out on the road, refusing to travel with them in his cart, he was under the absurd impression that his wooden cart would be contaminated by their touch. Such insults and indignities inflicted upon the untouchables were very common. They were unfit for human association. Bhim experienced many inequities in his youth, inequities that sank deeper into his consciousness. He experienced all the disadvantages of an unfair & unjust social order and had neither equal opportunities nor square deals.

The situation of the untouchables can be briefed as follows :-

- ❖ It was an offence for a member of the untouchable community to give high sounding names to their children. Their names be such as to indicate contempt.
- ❖ It was an offence for a member of the untouchable community to wear clean dresses to wear shoes or to wear ornaments.
- ❖ It was an offence for a member of untouchable community to speak a cultured language.
- ❖ Not only this but it was also an offence to touch or drink water from a common well/ Nallaha or river.
- ❖ It was an offence for a member of this community to enter any temple and worship the God (where animals had free access).
- ❖ This community had no profession of its own and was totally dependant on the mercy of high caste Hindus. These bonded labourers of the society were called "Balutedars".
- ❖ As they had no source of income and no means to

raise the income, no education they were dragging the carcasses, eating the carrion beef of carcasses, begging for food and wearing the clothes of dead.² Even the animals were ten times better than these living bodies.

What can one expect from such a society of untouchables. No education, no means of livelihood, no right to go to common places, no right to sit, eat or drink with high caste people, even the sources of water where animals had free access, untouchables were prohibited from using. And all of them were considered as Hindus. With this background if Dr. Ambedkar says "Society", "Nation", "Country" are just words. They are just amorphous ambiguous terms, who has a right and courage to contradict him ? What type of notion you expect from this undeveloped society regarding the idea of "Nation" regarding "Country" ? Even the highly developed and educated Tamils of today could not resist helping the tamils of Shrilanka. Does this not prove the statement of Dr. Ambedkar ? Arun Shourie who is talking so high about Swami Vivekananda, who had painful mind when a group of such under privileged people was converted to Christianity. The same Swami Vivekananda had no time to think and ponder over the miserable condition of his own "Hindu" people called untouchables. What a human service is this. What a hypocrisy is this ? Shourie is forging the icons of such people as deities of this country, who may be good Hindu scholars, but can't claim to have lead the masses of this country.

With the establishment of British Rule in India, the untouchables had new opportunities. They were given education, shelter, safety, food, equal opportunity and most importantly a feeling that they are human beings. They were appointed in post offices, courts and the police as messengers,

2. Rajani Kothari (ed), *Caste in Indian Politics* (Delhi 1985) P- 31
quoted by R.C. Prasad '*Preface to Ambedkarism*', P-30.

arbitrators of land disputes. What moral right caste Hindu has to accuse the untouchable for their joining the British Army ? They have no such right. And the attempt of Shourie to present this community as anti national, working for the British is absurd, ridiculous and heinous.

In periods of such crippling humiliations and disabilities, Bhim continued his studies, cultivating a spirit of patience in the school of experience. Some of his orthodox school teachers refused to show him any sympathy. They even refused to touch his note books. When thirsty none would allow him to touch the watercans nor pour out water into his mouth.

Yet another change in Bhim's life was already in the offing. His father, Ramji moved his children to Bombay where the family lived in a small dingy room situated in the labour area. Bhim started his High School education at Elphinstone school at Bombay. Family finances were such that he could not buy the books he wanted, but his father ungrudgingly supplied him with new books, borrowing money from his two married daughters on most of the occasions and at times pawning their ornaments.³

An incident recorded by Keer in his biography of Ambedkar sheds light on the inhuman humiliations experienced by Bhim in this period. It is said that when he was called upon by his teacher to come to the black board to solve a given problem, there was an uproar in protest, all class students shouting with derision of the untouchable who they feared would pollute their tiffin boxes kept behind the black board. The turmoil witnessed on that occasion came to an end only after the boys rushed to the black board and rescued their tiffin boxes from Bhim's so called polluting touch.

3. Narration from '*Preface to Ambedkarism*' by R.C. Prasad P- 35.

During all these years of his school life in Bombay, Bhim lived in the same one room tenement in the old chawl at Parel. There was no chance for the provision of study and the possibility of employing a tutor was beyond a dream. The small room was full of domestic articles and utensils. It was smoky and crowded. Fire wood was stored above head and also in one corner, and in the other corner was the fireplace. The room served as a kitchen, a parlour, a living room, a study room all in one. Bhim and his father had expected that Elphinstone Highschool would be free from hateful system of 'Caste' the ever present shadow of untouchability. They received one of the rudest shocks of their lives when Bhim was not allowed to study Sanskrit language. He had therefore to study Persian much against his will. Bhim passed his matriculation in 1907 with highest scoring of marks in Persian.

Bhim joined the Elphinstone College, Bombay. But his misfortune continued to dog his foot steps. The boy had no money to continue his education. His old well wisher K.A. Kaluskar having known Bhim's difficulties personally approached the then Maharaja of Baroda His Highness Sir Sayajirao Gaikwad, a noble hearted and broad minded ruler. The Maharaja of Baroda had made an announcement some time earlier at a meeting in Bombay offering his help to any worthy untouchable who wanted to pursue higher studies. At the request of Keluskar, the Maharaja of Baroda, called Bhim, asked him some searchy questions and having been completely satisfied with his replies assured him financial help for pursuing higher studies. He passed his Bachelor of Arts examination in 1913.

In June 1913, the Maharaja of Baroda Sayajirao announced that he would send some deserving students to U.S.A. for higher studies at Columbia University at the state expenses. Bhim requested Him to give him an opportunity. Bhim received the scholarship he applied for and was sent

to U.S.A. along with three others. At Columbia University in New York, he fell under the stimulating influence of the universities greats John Dewey, Charles Beard, Boas Seligman Minroe and others. He studied subjects like ancient and Modern History, Anthropology, Sociology, Psychology and Economics. Ambedkar obtained his Masters degree in 1915, for his thesis 'Ancient Indian Commerce' and later the degree of Doctor of Philosophy for his thesis 'The evolution of Provincial finance in British India'. In June 1916 Ambedkar submitted his thesis for the degree of Ph.D. This doctoral study was aptly entitled 'National Dividends for India : A Historical and analytical study'. He was the first Mahar to obtain such a degree and to achieve recognition for his excellent abilities. Having left Columbia University, Ambedkar proceeded to join the London school of Economics and Political Science as a graduate student. He also succeeded in getting admission to Gray's Inn, London for law. However after completing one year, he had to return to India due to expiry of his scholarship tenure. Ambedkar returned to India on 21st August 1917.

Ambedkar was appointed as Military Secretary to the Maharaja of Baroda, but he was not officially received by anyone on his arrival, nor any hotel or hostel accommodated him for he being a Mahar. Some how he stayed in a Parsee Dharmashala after hiding his caste. He received similar biased and undignified treatment in his office. Peons used to flung files on his table. Drinking water was not provided to him in his office. All this was unbearable to him. He sent a note to the Maharaja, but the Diwan expressed his inability to proceed further in the matter. On the top of this few people came to his residence at Parsee Dharam Shala and threatened him to vacate the Dharamshala within 24 hours. Even a learned untouchable could not soften the prejudices of the caste Hindus ! This mortifying treatment at the hands of caste Hindus compelled him to leave Baroda,

because howsoever learned, an untouchable may be, how can he stay with other caste Hindus or other caste people. Hungry, thirsty Ambedkar literally shed tears under a tree without any shelter. He left Baroda and came to Bombay in Nov. 1917.

Can any one imagine that a highly educated person like him could not wash the stigma of untouchability blotted on him. He was treated like a leper by his staff peons. They rolled the floormats when he got out to go. He could not find a place to stay anywhere merely because he was untouchable, so he stayed in a Parsee Inn where he was threatened to vacate the Inn. All these humiliations compelled him to leave Baroda. Tired hungry and fagged out, he sat under a tree and burst out into flood of tears. Shourie denies the difficulties faced by Dr. Ambedkar and says that Arobindo Ghosh, Swami Vivekananda too had to face the difficulties in their early life. Mr. Shourie this is a challenge to you to prove that both these people or any other Indian Hero faced the similar treatment worse than an animal in his own country, by his own people. No other country under the sky except the one where he was born, has evidences of a leper-like treatment which he and his society received.

Dr. Ambedkar returned to Bombay, grieved and frustrated. He made a quiet but firm resolve to fight this evil tooth and nail. This was to be his mission of life. In November 1918 Ambedkar joined Sydenham College, Bombay as professor of Political Economy and at once became so popular for his exceptional scholarship that students from other colleges flocked to his lectures.⁴ But he received the same humiliating treatment from all the sundry especially from the high caste professors., who objected to his drinking water from the pot reserved for professorial staff. He taught

4. Narration from '*Preface to Ambedkarism*' by R.C. Prasad P- 52.

in the college from the November 11th 1918 to 11th March 1920. Ambedkar resigned his post to continue his studies in Law and Economics in London with assistance rendered by Maharaja of Kolhapur, Shahu Chattrapti. In September 1920 he rejoined the London school of Economics and political Science and got entry into Gray's Inn to qualify as a barrister.

In June 1921 his thesis 'Provincial Decentralisation of Imperial Finance 'in British India' was accepted for M.Sc. (Econ.) degree by University of London. In 1923 he submitted his thesis on "The problem of Rupee? Its origin and its solution" for the degree of D.Sc. (Econ) which was subsequently published by P.S. King & Co. London.

In the light of this back ground one can easily understand what was the "Mission of Life" for Dr. Ambedkar. For a person of his calibre and education, it was not at all difficult to adorn a chair of honour and lead a peaceful life. But it was not his aim in life. He himself had experienced that howsoever educated, learned an untouchable may be, caste Hindus convert him into a bundle of hay. If this is the position of highly educated scholar., what about my people who are illiterate, poor, unemployed, scattered, slaves. He decided to struggle for the upliftment of these unprevilaged. Compassion and sorrow filled his heart and all his future activities, ventures, achievements, struggle, movements are all centered over only one basic thing and that is upliftment of the untouchables to the level of common masses. Practically he played the role of mother and father both for these untouchables. He made every possible effort, kept no stone unturned to uplift the untouchables.

As the approach of Caste Hindus towards these untouchables was devilish, there was no fun in approaching them for help. Whatever may be there at the back of mind of British rulers in helping the untouchables, but they were

definitely helpful for down troddens, Dr. Ambedkar is just utilising this fact and opportunity for the upliftment of his untouchables in a letter written to a member of British Cabinet Mission, Mr. A.V. Alexander on 14th May 1946; sarcastically quoted by Shourie.⁵ Dr. Ambedkar was also aware that the moment British leave this country the untouchables would again be made slaves, and it would be very difficult to safe guard their interest. So in this letter written to Mr.Alexander Dr. Ambedkar is utilising the facts in history for the benefit of his untouchables. It is perfectly in order and there is nothing to raise an eyebrow. And partiularly by the cult who spent their lives at the feet of British adorning the posts of honour.



5. Arun Shourie : *'Wroshipping false' Gods* P-4.

FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Before we embark on this issue, I would like to bring one thing to the notice of readers that even though Shourie in his book presented Mr. Gandhi as a Hero, he (Shourie) is neither his follower, nor he believes Mr. Gandhi. He belongs to the cult who have assassinated Mr. Gandhi. However shourie is using Mr. Gandhi very tactfully, being fully aware, the reactions of untouchables towards Mr. Gandhi, and attacking the untouchable community lurking behind the Mahatma., with full understanding that if depressed class people react, their target would be Mr. Gandhi, and not Shourie., so that shourie can enjoy the fighting. His mentality is no way different from that of America who supplies Arms to India & Pakistan both, fuels them and enjoys the profit earned out of Arms sale.

So, I would like to clear one thing, that relations of Dr. Ambedkar and Mr. Gandhi, and today the followers of both are of competitive antagonism. Without criticising the other party, we can't go ahead. But at the same time untouchables have nothing to say about the role of Mr. Gandhi in the other spheres of his life. But the role played by Mr. Gandhi in relation of untouchables is definitely a sore point, rather it is a black cat in the cupboard of Mr. Gandhi. So whatever criticism is going to follow on Mr. Gandhi, has a restricted meaning in relation to his untouchability role only. We are not here to condemn Mr. Gandhi in toto. Rather Dr. Ambedkar has praised Mr. Gandhi regarding his role in the vitalisation of the Congress. Congress which was a slave of High caste Hindus, and big Industrialists, was brought

to the common masses by Mr. Gandhi. Congress who was gratified in taking Annual meetings and few resolutions only, after Mr. Gandhi took charge of Congress, vitality and dynamism was poured in. And this is the opinion of Dr. Ambedkar which shourie missed.

Writer is obsessed with the idea that Indian National Congress was the only organisation who fought for the Independence of India. Rest of all other organisations did not do any thing. Writer is obsessed with the idea that all those individuals and or organisations who were pro-congress were "Nationalist". Those all who opposed congress were "Anti nationals". Every now & then he has pleded for Congress only. Does it Mean Indian National Army of Subhash Chandra Bose, Martyr like Bhagat Singh, V.B. Phadke, and other revolutionary group have no contribution in the Independence movement of India ?

There was a group working in this country who believed that political independance can't work efficiently unless it is conjointed with social and economical euqality. Gopal Ganesh Aagarkar, Mahadeo Govinda Ranade are few to name belonging to this school of thought. Mr. P.K. Atre a well known marathi scholar, writer and editor has precisely described the *modus oprendii* of Congress. *".....since last 25 years Congress is running its political activities on the assumption that British Raj is the only obstacle in the Independance of Hindustan. They assumed t6hat country would be independant as soon as British leave this country. How wrong this assumption was is being realised now".⁶*

"Casteism and untouchability are the biggest obstacle to establish democracy and socialism in Independant Hindustan. Until four fold social disorder exists in this country, socialism

6. Atre P.K. : 'Dalitanche Baba' (Marathi) P-7.

*cant thrive. Hence he (Dr. Ambedkar) refrained from fight for political independance. This caused lot of misunderstanding about him. His opponents made a propaganda that he is a British agent and enemy of Hindustan."*⁷

Those who did not take part in the freedom fight movement but worked for the social and economical equality, are month the less nationalists. But unfortunately Indian *modus vivindii* was very different. "He who fight against foreigners is" Nationalist", and the one who fights his own people (for the good cause) is 'anti national'. This is the theorem of our political ethics. And to the misfortune of Dr. Ambedkar he had to fight against the great person of the century i.e. Mahatma Gandhi., and against the biggest political organisation of the country i.e. Congress through out his life. All those who opposed Mr. Gandhi or Congress were quashed and thrown from the political and social scene."⁸

In short, fight for freedom for Congress and Mr. Gandhi was merely restricted to political independance. But fight for freedom for Dr. Ambedkar was much more than that. The depressed class people were slaves of slaves and needed double independance, one from the British rulers and other from High Caste Hindus. Dr. Ambedkar firmly believed that without social and economical equality political independance is just a lip service. And he devoted himself to free his people from the clutches of social and economical inequalities. If this leads to the title of "Anti national" then Mahadeo Govinda Ranade; Gopal Ganesh Aagarkar deserve the same title because they both did not participate in so called "Quit India movement." A dialogue between Dr. Ambedkar and Mr. Gandhi disproves the allegations on Ambedkar. This has occured after Round Table conference.

7 & 8. Atre P.K. : 'Dalitanche Baba' (Marathi) P-24 & 63.

Ambedkar :- "Gandhiji, I don't have mother land."

Gandhiji :- *"You have! I have received reports of RTC and they prove your patriotism."*⁹

When Gandhi who was a strong political opponent of Dr. Ambedkar has all the appreciation of Dr. Ambedkar as a patriot, why should we bother about the dwarfts like Shourie floats to the opinion & 'Research' of Shourie.

Writer has fragmented the issues, distorted the meaning and tried to canvass the same thing again and again like Gobels. Long mind boggling quotations and repeatations are used to confuse the readers. He also wants to give an aura to the reader that he is a very learned person and intelligent. The same issues can be streamlined in a very simple and lucid manner, so that reader can understand the issue in a better way.

SEPERATE ELECTORATE :-

Problem in front of Dr. Ambedkar was of emancipation of Depressed class, the untouchables. The untouchability which was deeply rooted in the minds of Hindu society for thousands of years. To eradicate this untouchability was not a simple job. It needed drastic measures to be adopted. Opportunity came to Dr. Ambedkar during Round Table conference. Writer Mr. Shourie who has an intension to confuse the readers and distort the facts, has given the half hearted information on separate electorate in piece meal in scattered way, and lost in quotations. Let us read the issue of Seperate electorate in Dr. Ambedkar's own language.

WHY ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE :-

In the Govt. of India act of 1919, there was a provision which had imposed an obligation on his Majesty's Govt. to

9. Dhananjay Keer : 'Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar' P-178.

appoint at the end of 10 years a Royal Commission to investigate into the working of the constitution and report upon such changes as may be found necessary. Accordingly in 1928 a Royal Commission was appointed under the Chairmanship of Sir John Simon. India expected that the commission would be mixed in its personnel. But Lord Birkenhead who was then, the Secretary of the state for India opposed to the inclusion of Indians and insisted on making it purely parliamentary commission. At this the Congress and the Liberals took great offence and treated it as an insult. They boycotted the commission and carried on a great agitation against it. To assuage this feeling of opposition it was announced by His Majesty's Govt. that after the work of the commission was completed, representative Indians would be assembled for a discussion before the new constitution of India is settled. In accordance with this announcement representative Indians were called to London at Round Table Conference with representative of parliament of His Majesty's Government.¹⁰ On 12th Nov. 1930, His late Majesty King George V formally inaugurated the Indian Round Table Conference.

The work of the Conference was distributed among nine committees. One of these committees was called the Minorities committee to which was assigned the most difficult work of finding a solution of the communal question. To safeguard the interests of Minorities Dr. Ambedkar submitted a memorandum to the minorities committee.

A scheme of Political Safeguards for the Protection of the Depressed Classes in the future constitution of a self-governing India, submitted to the Indian Round Table Conference :¹¹.

The following are the terms and conditions on which the Depressed Classes will consent to please themselves under a majority

10 & 11. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: 'Writing and Speeches', Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P-40 & 42 to 52.

rule in a self governing India.

CONDITION NO. 1 :-

Equal Citizenship :- The depressed classes cannot consent to subject themselves to majority rule in their present state of hereditary bondsmen. Before majority rule is established their emancipation from the system of untouchability must be an accomplished fact. It must not be left to the will of the majority. They Depressed classes must be made free citizens entitled to all the rights of citizenship in common with other citizens of the state.

A) To secure the abolition of untouchability and to create the equality of citizenship, it is proposed that the following fundamental rights shall be made part of the constitution of India.

Fundamental Right :- All subjects of the State in India are equal before the law and possess equal civic rights. Any existing enactment, regulation, order, custom or interpretation of law by which any penalty, disadvantage, disability is imposed upon or any discrimination is made against any subject of the state on account of untouchability shall, as from the day on which this constitution comes into operation, cease to have any effect in India."

B) To abolish the immunities and exemptions now enjoyed by executive officers by virtue of section 110 and 111 of Government of India act 1919 and their liability for executive action be made co-extensive with what is in the case of a European British subject.

CONDITION NO. 2

Free enjoyment of equal rights.

It is no use for the Depressed Classes to have a declaration of equal rights. There can be no doubt that the Depressed classes will have to face the whole force of orthodox society, if they try to exercise the equal rights of citizenship. The Depressed Classes therefore feel that if these declarations of rights are not to be mere pious pronouncements, but are to be realities of everyday life, then they should be protected by adequate pains and penalties from interference in the enjoyment of these declared rights.

A) The Depressed Classes therefore propose that the following section should be added to part XI of the Government of India acts 1919, dealing with offences, procedure and penalties :-

i) Offence of Infringement of Citizenship : Who ever denies to any person except for reasons by law applicable to persons of all classes and regardless of any previous condition of untouchability the full enjoyment of any of the accomodations, advantages, facilities, previlages of Inn, educational institutions, roads. paths, streets, tanks, wells and other watering places, public conveyance on land, air or water, theatres or other places of public amusement, resort, or convenience whether they are dedicated to or maintained or licenced for the use of the public shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to five years and shall also be liable to fine.

B) Obstruction by orthodox individual is not only menace to the Depressed classes in the way of peaceful enjoyment of their rights. The commonest form of obstruction is the social boycott. It is the most formidable weapon in the hands of orthodox classes with which they beat down any attempt on the part of Depressed classes to undertake any activity if it happens to be unpalatable to them. The way it works and the occassions on which it is brought into operation are well described in the report of the comittee appointed by the Government of Bombay in 1928 "to enquire into the educational, economic and social condition of the Depressed Classes and of the Aboriginal Tribes in the Presidency and the recommand measures for their uplift". The following is the extract for the same.

Depressed Classes and Social Boycott

"102 Although we have recommended various remedies to secure to the depressed classes their rights to all public utilities we fear that there will be difficulties in the way of their exercising them for along time to come. The first difficulty is fear of open violence against them by the orthodox classes. It must be noted that the depressed classes form a small minority in every village, opposed to which is a great majority of orthodox who are bent on protecting their interest and dignity from any suspected invasion by the Depressed classes at any cost. The danger of prosecution

by the police has put a limitation upon the use of violence by the orthodox classes and consequently such cases are rare.

"The second difficulty arises from the economic position in which the Depressed Classes are found today. The depressed Classes have no economic independance in most parts of the presidency. Some cultivate the land of orthodox classes as their tenants at will. Others live on their earnings as farm labourers employed by the orthodox classes and the rest subsist on the food or grain given to them by the orthodox classes in lieu of service rendered to them as village servants. We have heard of numerous instances where the orthodox classes have used their economic power as a weapon against those Depressed classes in their villages, when the latter has dared to exercise their rights, and have evicted them from their land, and stopped their employment and discontinued their remuneration as village servants. This boycott is often planned on such as extensive scale as to include the prevention of the Depressed Classes from using the commonly used paths and the stoppage of sale of the necessaries of life by the village Bania. According to the evidance sometimes small causes suffice for the proclamation of a social boycott against the depressed classes. Frequently it follows on the exercise by the depressed classes of their right to the use of common well, but cases have been by no means rare where a stringent boycott has been proclaimed simply because a depressed class man has put on the sacred thread, has bought a piece of land, has put on good clothes, or ornaments or has carried a marriage procession with the bridegroom on the horse through the public street.

"We do not know of any weapon more effective than this social boycott which would have been invented for the suppression of the depressed classes. The method of open violence pales away before it, for it has the most far reaching and deadening effects. It is more dangerous because it passes as a lawful method consistent with the theory of freedom of contact. We agree that this tyranny of the majority must be put down with firm hand, if we are to guarantee the Depressed Classes the freedom of speech and action necessary for their uplift. In the opinion of depressed classes the only way to overcome this kind of menace to their rights and liberties is to make social boycott an offence punishable by law. They are

therefore bound to insist that the following section should be added to those included in part XI, of the Government of India act 1919, dealing with offences, procedure and penalties.

offence of boycott defined, punishment for boycotting, punishment for instigating or promoting a boycott, punishment for threatening a boycott (details omitted).

Protection against discrimination:- The depressed classes entertain grave fears of discrimination either by legislation or by executive order being made in future. They cannot therefore consent to subject themselves to majority rule unless it is rendered impossible in law for the legislature or the executive to make any insidious discrimination against the depressed classes.

IT IS THEREFORE PROPOSED THAT the following statutory provision be made in the constitutional law of India.

"It shall not be competent for any legislature or executive in India to pass a law or issue an order, rule or regulation so as to violate the rights of the subjects of the state, regardless of any previous condition of untouchability, in all territories subject to the jurisdiction of the dominion of India.

- 1) To make and enforce contracts to sue, be parties and give evidence, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell hold and convey real and personal property.
- 2) To be eligible for entry into the civil and military employment and to all educational institutions except for such conditions and limitations as may be necessary to provide for the due and adequate representation of all classes of the subjects of the state.
- 3) To be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accomodations, advantages, facilities, educational institutions, previlages of inns, rivers, streams, wells, tanks, roads, paths, streets, public conveyances on land, air and water, theatres and other places of public resort or amusement except for such conditions and limitations applicable a like to all subjects of every race, class, caste, colour or creed.
- 4) To be deemed fit for and capable of sharing without distinction the benefits of any religious or charitable trust dedicated to or for persons

of the same faith and religion.

5) To claim full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property as is enjoyed by other subjects regardless of any previous condition of untouchability and be subject to like punishment pains and penalties and to none other.

CONDITION NO. IV

Adequate representation in the legislature :-

The depressed Classes must be given sufficient political power to influence legislative and executive action for the purpose of securing their welfare. In view of this they demand that the following provisions shall be made in the electoral law so as to give them -

- 1) Right to adequate representation in the Legislatures of the country, Provincial and Central.
- 2) Right to elect their own men as their representatives.
 - a) by adult suffrage, and
 - b) by separate electorates for the first ten years and thereafter by joint electorates and reserved seats, it being understood that joint electorates shall not be forced upon The Depressed Classes against their will unless such joint electorates are accompanied by adult suffrage.

CONDITION NO. V

Adequate representation in the services :-

The depressed classes have suffered enormously at the hands of the high caste officers who have monopolized the public services by abusing the law or by misusing the discretion vested in them in administering it to the prejudice of the Depressed Classes and to the advantage of the caste Hindus without any regard to justice, equity or good conscience. This mischief can only be avoided by destroying the monopoly of caste Hindus in the Public Services and by regulating the recruitment to them in such a manner that all communities including the depressed classes will have an adequate share in them. For this purpose the depressed classes have to make the following proposals for statutory enactment as a part of the constitutional law :-

1) There shall be established in India and in each Province in India a Public Service Commission to undertake the recruitment and control of the Public Services.

2) No member of the Public Service commission shall be removed except by a resolution passed by the legislature nor shall he be appointed to any office under the crown after his retirement.

3) It shall be the duty of Public Service Commission, subject to the tests of efficiency as may be prescribed.

a) to recruit the services in such a manner as will secure due and adequate representation of all communities, and

b) to regulate from time to time priority in employment in accordance with the existing extent of the representation of the various communities in any particular service concerned.

CONDITION NO. VI

REDRESS AGAINST PREJUDICIAL ACTION OR NEGLECT OF INTERESTS

In view of the fact that the Majority Rule of the future will be the rule of the orthodox, the Depressed Classes fear that such a Majority Rule will not be sympathetic to them and that the probability of prejudice to their interests and neglect of their vital needs cannot be overlooked. It must be provided against particularly because, however adequately represented the Depressed Classes will be in a minority in all legislatures. The Depressed Classes think it very necessary that they should have the means of redress given to them in the constitution. It is therefore proposed that the following provision should be made in the constitution of India:-

"In and for each Province and in and for India it shall be the duty and obligation of the Legislature and the Executive or any other Authority established by Law to make adequate provision for the education, sanitation, recruitment in Public Services and other matters of social and political advancement of the Depressed Classes and to do nothing that will prejudicially affect them.

"(2) Where in any Province or in India the provisions of this section are violated an appeal shall lie to the governor-General in Council from

any act or decision of any Provincial Authority and to the Secretary of State from any act or decision of Central Authority affecting the matter.

"(3) In every such case where it appears to the Governor-General in council or the Secretary of State that the Provincial Authority or Central Authority does not take steps requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this Section then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require the Governor-General in Council or the Secretary of State acting as on appellate authority may prescribe, for such period as they may deem fit, take remedial measures for the due execution of the provisions of this Section and of any of its decision under this Section and Which shall be binding upon the authority appealed against.

CONDITION NO. VII

Special Departmental Care

The helpless, hapless and sapless condition of the Depressed Classes must be entirely attributed to the dogged and determined opposition of the whole mass of the orthodox population which will not allow the Depressed Classes to have equality of status or equality of treatment. It is not enough to say of their economic condition that they are poverty - stricken or that they are a class of landless laboures, although both these statements are statements of fact. It has to be noted that the poverty of Depressed Classes is due largely to the social prejudices in consequence of which many an occupation for earning a living is closed to them. This is a fact which differentiates the position of the Depressed Classes from that of the ordinary caste labourer and is often a source of trouble between the two. It has also to be born in mind that the forms of tyranny and opperession practised against the Depressed Classes are very various and the capacity of the Depressed Classes to protect themselves is exteremely limited.....

CONDITION NO. VIII

Depressed Classes and the Cabinet

Just as it is necessary that the Depressed Classes should have the power to influence governmental action by seats in the Legislature

so also it is desirable that the Depressed Classes should have the opportunity to frame the general policy of the Government. This they can do only if they can find a seat in the Cabinet. The Depressed Classes therefore claim that in common with other minorities, their moral rights to be represented in the Cabinet should be recognized. With the purpose in view the Depressed Classes purpose : that in the Instrument of Instruction an obligation shall be placed upon the Governor - General to endeavour to secure the representation of the Depressed Classes in his Cabinet".

Any one who has read very depressing condition of untouchable would at once accept the demands put forward by Dr. Ambedkar in his memorandum. Mahatma Gandhi who was known for his compassion, opposed the demands of untouchables tooth and nail.

On the basis of this memorandum and discussions the minority committee made a report to the Round Table Conference, the relevant extract of which is as follows :-

5. 'Claims were therefore advanced by various committees that arrangement should be made for communal representation and for fixed proportion of seats. It was also urged that the number of seats reserved for minority community should be in no case less than its proportion in the population. The methods by which this could be secured were mainly three

(1) Nomination

(2) Electorates

(3) Seperate electorate.'

6. Nomination was unanimously deprecated.

7. Joint electorate : doubts were expressed that whilst such a system of election might secure representation of minorities, it provided no guarantee that the representative would be genuine.....

8. The discussion made it evident that the demand which remained as the only one which would be generally acceptable was Separate electorate.

It evolves what is a very difficult problem for solution i.e. what

should be the amount of communal representation in various provinces and in the centre, that if the whole or practically whole of the seats in a legislature are to be assigned to communities there will be no room for the growth of independent political opinion or of true political parties.¹²

(so it is evident that discussion through all angles was going on in a scientific way.)

Everything was going on smoothly. Although agreement on details was lacking it was unanimously accepted that the untouchables were entitled to recognition as a separate entity for political and constitutional purposes. The only party in the country whose attitude to this decision of RTC was not known when first session of RTC was closed was the congress. This was because the congress had boycotted the RTC and was busy in carrying on Civil disobedience against the Government. By the time the second session of RTC became due a compromise between His Majesty's Government and Congress was reached as a result of which the congress agreed to participate in RTC.¹³

When the delegates assembled for the second session of RTC the Federal Structure Committee met first. On 15th Sept. 1931 when the meeting was organised for federal structure Mr. Gandhi spoke on untouchability, when it was not called for.¹⁴ Reader may imagine the reason behind. "The Congress has, from its very commencement taken up the cause of the so called 'untouchables'. There was a time when congress had at every annual session as its adjunct the social conference to which the late Ranade dedicated his energies, among his many other activities..... But in 1920 Congress took a large step and brought in question of removal of untouchability as a plank on the political platform making it an important item of the political programme."¹⁵

12,13, 14 & 15 Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P-52 to 56.

I find it quite perplexing and absurd for Mr. Gandhi talking on untouchability in the committee of federal structure. There was absolutely no reason or time to talk on untouchability. On 17th Sept. 1931 in federal structure committee expressing his views, Mr. Gandhi made the statement :

*"I come to sub head (v) representation by social constituencies of special interests. I here speak for Congress. The congress has reconciled itself to special treatment of Hindu Muslim Sikh tangle. There are sound historical reasons for it., but the congress will not extend the doctrine in any shape or form. I listened to the list of special interest so far as untouchables are concerned., I have not yet quite grasped what Dr. Ambedkar has to say but of course the congress will share the honour with Dr. Ambedkar of representing the interests of untouchables. (He has as yet not talked a single word for federal structure) They are as clear to the Congress as the interest of any other body or any other individual throughout the length and breadth of India. Therefore I would most strongly resist any further special representation."*¹⁶

Can any one tell me what was objectionable in the memorandum of Dr. Ambedkar, submitted to Minorities committees. Was it the demand of fundamental rights, was it the demand of free enjoyment of equal rights, was it regarding social boycotts, what was wrong in his demands and why was Mr. Gandhi against the representation of untouchables in legislature. When Mahatma had no objection for special representation for Muslims, when special representation to Sikhs (who are hindus) does not vivisect the Hindy society, why special representation to untouchables only cause 'vivisection of Hindy society.' No rational, no reasoning of any sort was put forward by either Mr. Gandhi or his pleaders.

16. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: 'Writing and Speeches', Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P-57.

Does this not sound fishy. No settlement was arrived at between the three parties during adjournment.

Objection was raised by Dr. Ambedkar to this adjournment Dr. Ambedkar put forward the evidence to prove that Mr. Gandhi used unfair practice to condemn the demands of untouchables. He (Mr. Gandhi) made separate and secrete negotiation with Muslims.¹⁷

Inspite of all this settlement could not be brought up. Hence finally Mr. Gandhi spoke....." I propose to use the failure as a stepping stone to success and I invite you all to do like wise ; but should all efforts at agreement fail even RTC reached the end of its labours I would suggest the addition of a clause to the expected constitution appointing a judicial tribunal that would examine all claims and give its final decision on all the points that may be left unsettled."¹⁸ Thus Mr. Gandhi left the future of the Nation to the decision of tribunal. He did not talk a single word on federal structure or any other issue of National Interest. But talk against rights of untouchables. Does this not prove that he came to R.T.C. only to thwart interests of untouchables ?

Acting on the suggestion of Prime Minister the minorities met to consider if they could produce settlement. They produced a settlement which was submitted to the Prime Minister in the evening before the next meetings of minorities committee which took place on 13th Nov. 1931. This document of settlement amongst minorities committee was known as 'Minorities Pact'. Mr. Gandhi was very unhappy to know that untouchables are given a separate political entity. He spoke, "I would like to repeat what I have said before, that while the congress will always accept any solution that may be acceptable to Hindus, the Muhammadans and the Sikhs, congress will be

17, 18. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: '*Writing and Speeches*', Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P-72 & 64.

no party to the special electorates for any other minorities..... One word more as to the so called untouchables. *I can understand the claims advanced by other minorities but the claims advanced on behalf of the untouchables, at that time is the 'unkindest cut of all'. In the same lecture he says, "I do not mind untouchables, if they so desire being converted to Islam or Christianity. I would tolerate that but I cannot possibly tolerate what is in the store for Hinduism if there are two divisions set forth in villages."*¹⁹ This is the verdict of the same Mahatma who favoured "Vaishnav Jan to tene kahiye, jo pid parayi jane re". He is the same Mahatma who could tolerate seperate electorate for sikhs, Muslims, Anglo-Indians, Christians but not for untouchables. He is the same Mahatma, who could tolerate their (Untouchables) change of religion to christianity or Islam but not their representation in the legislature. Is it not a true face of Mahatma. It is the same community which was kicked by high caste Hindus, and paralysed by the society. This is the same community who was living in a condition worse than that of animals, and this was the compassion of Mahatma towards this community.

Knowing that there was no hope of getting an agreed solution before adjourning the minorities comittee, the chairman made a suggestion. "will you each of you, every member of this comittee sign a request to me to settle the community question and pledge yourself to accept my decision ? That I think is a 'very fair offer'".²⁰ Mr. Gandhi signed this agreement, to abide by the decision given by the Prime Minister regarding communal matters.

On page No. 65 Shourie writes "The British let him leave England (i.e. after RTC). He had but landed in India and they threw him into jail. A few months later they announced their Communal Awards." This speaks as if it

19, 20. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: 'Writing and Speeches', Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P-69.

was a conspiracy organised by Dr. Ambedkar and the British. But the fact is different. Mr. Gandhi gave an interview to the News Paper in Rome after finishing Round Table Conference where he threatened to revive his campaign of civil disobedience. Hence Mr. Gandhi on his arrival was arrested and put in jail.²¹ But Shourie presented the matter in such a way that it should look like conspiracy of Dr. Ambedkar and British. This is how Shourie has mis-used the information to arouse sentiments of parties concerned. He has an malice against the untouchable society. He has the intension of fueling the communal disharmony.

On 17th August 1932 the decision of Prime Minister on Communal question was announced. Concerned paragraph reads as follows :

9. Members of the "depressed Classes" qualified to vote will vote in a General constituency. In view of the fact that for a considerable period these classes would be unlikely, by this means alone, to secure any adequate representation in the legislature a number of special seats will be assigned to them. These seats will be filled by election from special constituencies in which only members of the Depressed Classes electorally qualified will be entitled to vote. Any person voting in such a special constituency will, as stated above be also entitled to vote in General Constituency. It is intended that these constituencies should be formed in selected areas where depressed classes are most numerous.....

"His Majesty's Government do not consider that these special Depressed Classes constituencies will be required for more than limited time. They intend that the constitution shall provide that they shall come to an end after 20 years if they have not previously been abolished under the general powers of electoral revision referred to in paragraph 6."²²

21, 22. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: *Writing and Speeches*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P-77 & 82.

Now any person having some logical sense and compassion for down troddens should explain me as to how this system of electorate was harmful to the society ? Contradiction to this Separate Electorate put forward by writer on page 222 is baseless and illelogical and a concrete example of intellectual bankruptcy. It proves that writer has lost the capacity of drawing logical conclusions. They are the great statements who have a deep study of human mind, society and the nation, who can penetrate curtain of time and give correct predictions about future. In contrast see the prophecy of Mahatma Gandhi which he had made like a statesman, when there was no agreed solution to communal tangle"..... The solution can be the crown of the Swaraj constitution, not its foundation - if only because our differences have hardened, if they have not arisen, by reason of the foreign domination. I have not the shadow of doubt that the iceberg of communal differences will melt under the warmth of the Sun of freedom."²³

And immediately after Independance there was civil war, not amongst depressed classes and Hindus, but among Hindu and Muslims, the same Muslim community which was pampered by Mr. Gandhi. To day, even after 50 years of Independance can anyone say with confidence that communal differences have melted away with the warmth of the Sun of freedom; inspite of the fact that Separate electorate is not in operation. This proves that cry of Mr. Gandhi was wrong. And his statement made like a statesman melted away, the day Independance arrived. These are not the versions of statemen versions of statemen are eternal sentences. They stand true even after a span of time. Dr. Ambedkar had such calibre. His statements are proving true even now i.e. 40 years after his death.

23. Arun Shourie : 'Worshipping False Gods' P-225.

Then there was dispatch of letters from British Officials to Mr. Gandhi and from Mr. Gandhi to British officials related to communal Awards. On 11th March 1932 Mr. Gandhi wrote to Sir Samuel Hoarse the Secretary of State, to London, in which he expressed his view point against separate electorate. He writes"..... *But separate electorate would harm them; as they would harm Hinduism the depressed classes were dependant on so called caste Hindus. Gandhiji pointed out this separation of electorates would tear them away, moreover it would "Vivisect and disrupt Hinduism"*²⁴. So it is evident that Mr. Gandhi was more interested in keeping Hinduism intact than upliftment of untouchables. Moreover how separate electorate would vivsect Hinduism the society which is already in multi fragments is not explained by him.

It would be interesting to note the opinion of Mr. P.K. Atre on this issue. He says "*Had the Congress worked hard on anihilation of untouchability since begining and co-operated Dr. Ambedkar bestowing the untouchability programme to the good conscious of Dr. Ambedkar, the world would have seen six crore of untouchables joining hands with congress. Gandhiji thwarted Ambedkar by proclaiming that he is the only representative of the untouchables. Scheduled caste federation is an answer of Dr. Ambedkar to the egotism of Mr. Gandhi.*"²⁵

Anxiety expressed by Mr. Gandhi was imaginary and illogical. He has not expressed same anxiety in accepting Separate electorate for Sikhs, Anglo-Indians and Christians. When Mr. Gandhi found that his threat has failed to have any effect, He wrote a letter to Prime Minister on 18th Aug.1932 wherein he threatened to go on fast till death if the communal

24. Arun Shourie : 'Worshipping False Gods' P-236.

25. Navyug Daily : 13/07/1947; compiled in Dalitanche Baba by Atre, P-9.

award was not withdrawn. Prime Minister in his letter on 8th Sept. 1932 expressed his inability to do so and informed that the concerned communities only can substitute other electoral arrangement for this, that Govt. has devised. Finding that Prime Minister did not yield to his threat, on 20 Sept. 1932. Mr. Gandhi commenced his "Fast unto death" as a protest against grant of separate electorate to the untouchables. Later on a writer spend lot many pages on letters and telegrams which were sent to and fro which do not reveal anything and is wastage of the time of readers. But one thing is sure Mr. Gandhi has left the legacy of fast unto death used by him as a trump card, is now used by his followers to black mail and wreck the government machinery.

So the famous fast of Mr. Gandhi started on 20 Sept. 1932 at Yervada jail, Poona -the fast unto death-. This aroused a very strong reaction. Dr. Ambedkar was looked upon as a villain. He was threatened by many. But Dr. Ambedkar was facing the greatest dilemma of his life. There was before him the problem of saving the political rights of untouchables which Prime Minister has given to them. Also there was before him the duty which he owed as a part of common humanity i.e. to save Gandhiji from sure death. He responded the call of humanity and saved the life of Mahatma by agreeing to alter the communal award in a manner satisfactory to Mr. Gandhi. This agreement is known as Poona Pact.²⁶ Mr. Atre has very powerfully described this situation. He says "*Dr. Ambedkar, Mahar by caste, saved the life of Mahatma Gandhi by signing the Poona pact and accepted a great loss to himself and his society. At the same time A Brahmin Mr. Nathuram Godase assassinated Mr. Gandhi. It is painful to note that Hindu society could not understand this.*"²⁷

26. Dr. Ambedkar : 'Writing and Speeches', Govt. of Mah. Pub., Vol. IX, P-88.

27. Maratha Daily : Compiled in Dalitanche Baba by P.K. Atre P-32.

Here I would like to quote a cross reference written in a book "Indira" by Pupal Jaykar and tally it with Shourie's one. And I leave the inference to the good conscious of readers. Mere agreement of Poona pact was not sufficient for Mr. Gandhi. He wanted the British Govt. to accept the agreement unconditionally and withdraw separate electorate completely. He had no faith in British officials. Lastly message came from London and Gandhiji decided to break the fast at 5.30 P.M. that evening. Pyarelal describes the scene : "The yard was freshly sprinkled over with water. Gandhiji lay on his cot surrounded by the poet, Shrimati Sarojini Naidu, Shrimati Vasanti Devi, Shrimati Swaroop Rani, Shrimati Urmila Devi, Ambalal Sarabhai and his family, Gandhiji's two companions, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel & Sjt. Mahavev Desai. Before him were assembled a number of inmates of the Sabarmati Ashram and others in all about 200 persons. The poet led the prayer by singing a Bengali hymn from Gitanjali.

"Jeevan jakhan shukayajaye, karuna-dharaye aisho

Sakal madhuri urkaye jaye, geet-sudharse aisho"

This was followed by the reciting of some Sanskrit verses by Parchure Shastri a fellow prisoner fromt the leper ward of the Yervada prison. Then was sung all joining Gandhiji's favourite hymn "Vaishnava Jana", When it was finished Shrimati Kasturba handed him the orange juice and Gandhiji broke his fast.²⁸ Now let us see what Pupul Jaykar says in her famous book 'Indira'. Indira wrote her father".....It was approximately 5.00 O'clock in the evening and Bapu does not eat anything after 6.00 O'clock. hence Dr. Tagore and jail officers persuaded Gandhiji not to wait for Ambedkar. I immediately prepared juice from two oranges. Dr. Tagore sang a Bengali song and Bapu's favourite 'Vaishnava Jana' was sung by Ashram people. Bapu accepted juice and

28. Pyarelal, 'The Epic fast', Navjivan, Ahmedabad 1932, P. 79-80.

delivered fruits and sweets to every one. After a day long tension we returned home cheerfully²⁹.

□ Does not this indicate that Gandhiji had accepted juice even before Dr. Ambedkar had signed the Poona pact.

Thus Gandhiji succeeded in snatching the Armour (Separate electorate) of the Depressed Classes, by trick, using the trump card of 'Fast unto death'. Is this not the real face of Mahatma ? Dr. Ambedkar was no better than "Karna" of Mahabharata, where in, Indra snatches his armour by conspiracy and trick. Let us see that is the opinion of a veteran leader Mr. Ram Manohar Lohiya on this issue. *"Had the National Leaders been ready to give special representation and benefits to depressed classes since beginning, then, Hindu-Muslim, untouchables, Harijans and Ansar & Momins from Muslim community would have lived together amicably, atleast they would have fought for the National Independance unitedly."*³⁰

Exactly the same opinion is expressed by a veteran Marathi scholar Mr. P.K. Atre. Well Mr. Shorie, what do you say ?

So Mr. Gandhi who spoke on untouchability in the comittee of Federal structure when not called for, Mr. Gandhi, who denied separate electorate only to untouchables but agreed to give the same to Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Ango-Indians, Mr. Gandhi who made secret pact with Muslims to counteract untouchables, Mr. Gandhi who agreed to abide by the decision given by Prime Minister, violated it, when communal award was declared. Mr. Gandhi, who used his trump card of fast unto death to snatch the armour of untouchables, and possibly broke his fast even before the actual pact was signed, the same Mr. Gandhi is Mahatma

29. Pupul Jaykar : 'Indira Gandhi' translation in Marathi by Ashok Jain P-40.

30. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya : 'Bhartiya Phalniche Gunhegar' (Marathi) P-84.

and Dr. Ambedkar who throughout his life fought for the upliftment of untouchables, for helpless people keeping aside his health problems and personal gains, is villain : What a great justice Mr. Shourie.

Issue of Temple Entry is criticised by Shourie in his typical unscientific way. Here is a narration of stand taken by untouchables on Temple entry. "The Poona pact was signed on 24th Sept. 1932. On 25th Sept. 1932 a public meeting of the Hindus was held in Bombay to accord to it their support. And various resolutions were passed to give untouchables an access to public places. This resolution was followed by a feverish activity on the part of Hindus to throw open Temples to the untouchables. "Harijan" a weekly paper started by Mr. Gandhi published a long list of temples thrown open & schools thrown open to untouchables.

"When the owners or trustees of temples were not prepared to throw open their temples to the untouchables, the Hindus actually started Satyagraha against them. Satyagraha by Mr. Kelappan for securing entry to the untouchables in the temple at Guruvyur was a part of this agitation. Temple entry Bills were produced by many. In this agitation Mr. Gandhi also joined. Before 1932 Mr. Gandhi was opposed to allow untouchable to enter Hindu Temples. To quote his own words Mr. Gandhi said.

*"How it is possible that the Antyajas (untouchable) should have the right to enter all the existing temples ? As long as the law of caste & Ashram has the Chief place in Hindu religion, to say that every Hindu can enter every temple is a thing that is not possible to day."*³¹

Hence his joining the movement of Temple entry was a great surprise. Was it a change of Heart or realisation that

31. Gandhi Shikshan, Vol.II, P-132.

political separation between Hindus & untouchables may lead to severance of cultural & religious ties or was it abolition of untouchables claim to be separate from Hindus ?

Attitude of untouchables to Temple entry Bill (Feb.1933)

- 1) The Bill cannot hasten the day of temple entry for the Depressed classes than would otherwise be the case.
- 2) The Bill does not regard untouchability in temple as a sinful custom. It regards untouchability merely as a social evil, but does not declare it as illegal. If untouchability is sinful & immortal custom then in the view of Depressed class it must be destroyed without any hesitation even to if it is acceptable to the majority. This is what the Bill does not do. Rather social evil of drinking & untouchability are at per for the writer of the Bill.

Dr. Ambedkar further explains, Temple entry is not an answer to the problems of untouchables. Education, employment and better ways of living & earning is more important for untouchables than temple entry. On the spiritual point of view he asks "Is the temple entry to be a final goal" of the advancement in the social status of the deparment classes in the Hindus fold ? Or it is only the first step & if it is the first step what is the ultimate goal? Temple entry as a final goal the Depressed classes can never support. What the depressed classes want is a religion, which would give them equality of social status. The mere provision to permit temple entry for all cannot make it a religion of equality of social status. What is required is to purge it of the doctrine of chaturvarna. That is the root casue of all in equality and also the parent of the caste system & untouchability, which are merely forms of inequality. Unless it is done not only will the Depressed Classes reject Temple entry, they will also reject the Hindu faith.³²

32. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P. 108-112.

1937 ELECTIONS :-

After snatching the political armour (seperate electorate) of untouchables and Dr. Ambedkar, Mr. Gandhi and his Congress started giving jolts to already injured untouchable movement. They left no stone unturned to weaken Dr. Ambedkar. Shourie writes "Sardar Patel who was handling the organisation of the congress campaign wrote to the President of the Vidarbha provincial Congress Comittee. *"The question of Scheduled Caste candidate in your province and in Nagpur requires careful consideration. The Mahar community is largely found in these areas, and hence we must particularly (take) care to see that no one of the followers of Dr. Ambedkar succeeds."*³³

With the help of propaganda, money and Halo (as freedom fighter organisation) around congrss, congress could get good number of seats in 1937 elections, and shourie quoted "congress did extremely well in the seats which had been reserved for Harijans." But this is a false interpretation. 1937 elections were very crucial for congress and Dr. Ambedkar both and both made every attempt to win the elections. Had there been separate electorate the question of winning would not have raised. The electoral fight of 1937 was a fight between a weak and very strong party, an unequal fight, and doesnot justify the rejoicing of Shourie. But as Shourie has discussed these elections at length and presented a wrong interpretation to readers, it is necessary to put forward the facts regarding this election.

Dr. Ambedkar writes "What do Congressmen mean when they say that the election of 1937 shows that the congress represents untouchables ? The question can have two meanings. It may mean that those untouchable candidates who stood on congress tickets for reserved

33. Sardar Patel's correspondance. Durgadas Edi. Vol.II P. 344-345.
quoted by Arun Shourie : 'Worshipping False Gods' P-50

seats were elected as against those untouchable candidates who did not stand on congress tickets. It may also mean that more votes were cast by the untouchables voters in favour of those untouchable candidates who stood on congress tickets than other untouchable candidates. I propose to examine the returns from both points of view.³⁴

The results of election in terms of seats won are as follows:-

Table 6

Congress strength in Provincial assemblies

Province	Total Strength of the assembly	congress strength in the assembly
Assam	108	35
Bengal	250	60
Bihar	152	95
Bombay	175	85
C.P. & Berar	112	70
Madras	215	159
Orissa	60	36
Punjab	175	18
Sind	60	08
U.P.	228	134
N.W.F.P.	50	19
Total	1585	719

34. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P-155.

Table 7

Congress strength in Provincial councils

Province	Total Strength of the council	Congress strength in the council
Assam	18	Nil
Bengal	57	10
Bihar	26	08
Bombay	26	14
Madras	46	26
Total	173	58

These tables show that taking the two houses together the congress secured 777 seats out of 1758. The congress obviously is not a majority party. It did not secure even half the number of seats.

What is the position of Congress in terms of voting strength ? The following figures will show that even in the point of voting strength the congress came out as a minority.

Table 8

Abstract of votes cast in the election distributed as between congress & Non congress parties.

Province		Total Votes cast of congress	Votes cast in favour of Non congress	Votes cast in favour
Madras	Assembly	4327734	2658966	1668768
	council	33511	16907	16604
Bombay	Assembly	3408308	1568093	1840215
	Council	23730	9420	14310
Bengal	Assembly	3475730	1055900	2419830
	Council	5593	1489	4104
U.P.	Assembly	3362736	1899325	1463411
	Council	9795	1580	8215
Bihar	Assembly	1477668	992642	485026
	Council	4318	96	4222
C.P.	Assembly	1317461	678265	639196
Assam	Assembly	522332	129218	393114
	Council	2623	Nil	2623
NWFP	Assembly	179529	43845	135684
Orissa	Assembly	304749	198680	106069
Sind.	Assembly	333589	18944	314645
Total		20500340	9454635	11045705

These must also be read in the light of other circumstances 1. Level of franchise 2. Relative position of two parties in election. Regarding level of franchise, only about 10% of the population was given the right to vote. The high franchise made the electorate a hive of the middle and intellectual classes, both of which were intensely pro congress.³⁵ Regarding position of parties congresss and non congress were not a match at all. Congress had media, money, organisation and Image. Non congress had none.

"Let us examine the claim of the Congress to represent the

35. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P-149.

untouchables in terms of votes cast in favour of the congress untouchable candidates. The total number of votes cast by the untouchable voters in the election of 1937 numbered 1586456. The following table shows how they were distributed, how many were cast in favour of congress untouchable and how many in favour of Non Congress untouchable candidate.

Table 10

Province	Voting by untouchable voters		
	In favour of congress	Against congress	Total of untouchable votes cast in election.
United Province	52,609	79,571	132,180
Madras	126,152	195,464	321,616
Bengal	59,464	624,797	684,443
Central Province	19507	115,354	134,861
Bombay	12971	158,076	171,047
Bihar	8654	22187	30841
Punjab	Nil	69126	69126
Assam	5320	22437	27727
Orissa	5878	8707	14585
Total	290,737	1,295,719	1,586,456

Applying this test it is clear that out of 1.586,456 votes only 290,737 i.e. 18% have been cast in favour of the Congress. 82% have been against the congress. Can there be any evidence more conclusive against the congress claim to represent the untouchables.³⁶

Congressmen may not accept voting strength as a measuring rod. They may continue to base the claim of the congress to represent the untouchables on the ground of seats captured. No sane man will look upon 78 out of 151 or majority of 5 as a victory worth talking about.³⁷

Possibly Shourie has not read this most logical and

36, 37. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P. 156-157.

scientific analysis given by Dr. Ambedkar. Rather he continued to make a mad rush in pleading the congress and its false claim. What he says that Dr. Ambedkar gave reasons upon reasons for the failure are in real sense a scientific analysis of election returns. And Dr. Ambedkar has successfully shown that claim of congress to represent untouchables is a false claim. A candidate whose majority is due to votes of person other than untouchables how can he say that he represents untouchables. And if Shourie is unable to understand even this, he better join some Kinder Garden School.

There are two types of leaders in any community. One is sincere, committed, having intensions, desire and capacity to work for the community, and the other is a bluff/fraud, opportunist and utilises every situation for his personal gains. Congress since begining was in search of such stooges, who would work for the congress and congress would claim to represent untouchables. This game is still going on. Separate electorate would have averted this situation and real leaders of the untouchables would have been elected. This threat was realised by Mr. Gandhi and that is why he fought against the separate electorate tooth & nail. The untouchable political leaders who are stooges of Congress or other political parties are the real enemies of the untouchables. Mr. Kanshiram a leader of Bahujan Samaj Party illustrated this fact very nicely in his book "Chamacha Age".

In the pursuit of criticism Shourie forgets what he is critising & looses the reference & context making his statement laughable. Quotation taken from the Diary of Indrani Ram is an example Jagjivan Ram through out his political life never shown the tightness of his spine. In contrast Dr. Ambedkar always threw the things if they hurt his ego. So it is next to impossible that Dr. Ambedkar requested Babu Jagjivan Ram for a ministerial post. Even enemies of Dr.

Ambedkar would accept this fact. Standing of Mr. Jagjivan Ram in congress party at that time was too negligible to recommend Dr. Ambedkar. Moreover Mr. Jagjivan Ram was not a lolly pop baby to bring a strong political opponent like Ambedkar in central Ministry & ruin his own carrier. There are clear evidences that Mr. Gandhi recommended Dr. Ambedkar, for a ministry post. But for Shourie, - 'research scholar' - this diary of Indrani Ram is the most authentic document.

Through out his book Shourie presented the pseudo compassion of congress towards untouchables. Dr. Ambedkar in his book 'What congress and Gandhi have done to untouchables' has torn this mask and exposed real face of congress. It is beyond the scope of this book to give all the possible details. However I cant resist to put forwad some salient features :

"Since the inception of Congress i.e. 1885 it was felt by the leaders of the movement that the National movement should not be exclusively political but side by side questions affecting Indian social economy should also be discussed, proponents of which were Dewan Bahadur R. Raghunath Rao & Mr. Justice M.G. Ranade. In 1886 discussions were held whether separate body should be set up for social questions and lastly "Indian National Social Conference" was started. The social reform party was not happy with the attitude of congress, completely dissociating itself from the question of social reforms. One can get this idea by reading the Presidential address in the annual meeting of Congress. In 1886 Dadabhai Navroji has turned negative for social reforms.³⁸

"In 1887 the then President, Mr. Badruddin Tayyabji declared the same thing and said, that the social reform should be dealt with by a particular comittee. In 1892 W.C. Banerjee has openly said that I have little faith in public discussion of social matters and congress to be devoted

38. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P-7.

to political matters only. In 1895 Surendranath Banerjee gave a clearcut verdict that congress is a purely political organisation and not a social movement. In 1895 when congress met in poona for annual conference, the group of people not in favour of social reforms treated to burn the congress pendal if the congress allowed it to be used by the social conference. This resulted in that the congress decided not to entertain any question of social reform, no matter how urgent and congress remained totally a political organisation from 1895 to 1916.

"But in 1917 a strange event took place. India National Congress held at Calcutta passed the following resolution. 'This congress urges upon the people of India, the necessity, justice and righteousness of removing all disabilities imposed by custom upon the depressed classes. The disabilities being of a most vexatious and opperassive character, subjecting those classes to considerable hardship and inconvenience'.

This was not any repentance. Definitely not. It was merely an eye wash. And there is reason to believe that it was an eye wash. The then President of Congress Mrs. Annie Beasant who was never friendly to the untouchables and her article on 'The upliftment of the Depressed classes' in India Review in Feb. 1909 clearly states her opinion on the issue which is nothing but the antipathy for the untouchables. Then why congress weared the mask of prountouchables. Reasons may be meeting held by Depressed class society in 1917 and Mr. Montagu's announcement of self governing institutions. The congress which has opposed social reforms in all her presidential addresses since 1886 to 1895, suddenly aroused its interest in social reforms in 1917 gives a definite scope for suspicion.

From 1919 Mr. Gandhi took over the charge of congress and he revolutionised the old congress. He brought vitality and dynamism in congress. For social amelioration they formed constructive programme. To finance these activities they started "Tilak-Swaraj-Fund" of one Crore rupees. Social amelioration programme was outlined by working comittee at its meeting in Bardoli in 1922 and hence called as Bardoli programme, Upto May 1923 no progress was done as per guidelines chalked out and terminally the issue was handed over to All India Hindu Mahasabha, -

a militant Hindu organisation - which could be the last to rely on the matter of social reform. And thus congress got rid of its responsibility of social reforms". IS IT NOT A PROOF THAT MR. GANDHI AND CONGRES'S COMPASSION FOR UNTOUCHABLES ARE 'CROCODILE TEARS'

The Tilak - Swaraj - Fund of Rs. One Crore and thirty lakh which was a Public fund given for reconstructive programme of congress was spent on all sort of sundry work except for the purpose for which it was raised. Inspite of being fully aware of this looting of public fund Mr. Gandhi overlooked it. Is this the sincerity of congress towards untouchables ? It is nothing but fooling the masses and untouchables to pull them in congress. Compassion ? of Mr. Gandhi and congress towards untouchables was nothing but crocodile tears. Can there be any proof better than this. All these things are discussed by Dr. Ambedkar in his book 'What congress and Gandhi have done to untouchables'. Interested readers may go through this book. And hence seer Dr. Ambedkar was more than correct in saying that "There have been many Mahatmas in India whose sole objective was to remove untouchability and to elevate and absorbe the depressed classes., but everyone has failed in his mission. Mahatmas have come and Mahatmas have gone, but the untouchables have remained untouchables. These Mahatmas raise lot of dust, but do not raise the level of society."³⁹

Writer who shamelessly writes "Their (Dr. Ambedkar) eye was on the 25 lakhs rupees."⁴⁰ Should go through the details of Tilak-Swaraj-Fund - A huge amount of Rs. One crore and thirty lakh rupees raised for social reform activity, and should also see in what way it was expended by congress. And this explains, rather it is an eye opener about the congress and its approach towards upliftment of untouchables.

39,40. Arun Shourie : 'Worshipping False Gods' P-277 & 327.

Real face of Shourie :-

*"Gandhiji had no alternative but to swallow reservations within joint electorate as a lesser evil. This evil was of course to be the beginning, it has spawned what we see today-reservations not just in legislature but in services, reservations not just at entry in the services, reservations in promotions too, far from the measure being wound up in twenty years, it has become an evil which has continued to swell every few years..... that step has spawned an entire ideology in which jobs are a matter of right, not something for which a person must work and excel."*⁴¹ This is the face of Shourie, - the Manuwadi, antireservationist, antiuntouchable face.

'SOME PEOPLE NEVER DO ANY EXERCISE EXCEPT JUMPING TO WRONG CONCLUSIONS' Mr. Shourie appears to be a champion of this. It is unfortunate that in spite of 50 years of Independance depressed classes have remained depressed classes & the so called Caste Hindus & antireservationist could not understand the meaning of reservation. Dr. Ambedkar has many a times quoted a simile of stable to explain the necessity of reservations in legislature, executives and Govt. services. He explained that the depressed class people are like weak, sick, and injured horses. But there are strong & stout horses too (Caste Hindus) in the Stable. If food is served to them at a common place who would succeed in getting maximum food ? Obviously the strong and stout one. Sick and injured horses would be driven away and they would starve and become weak and weak. If you want to bring these weak horses to the level of strong one, special measures need to be taken to feed them. They need little more food in a separate place, in a protected area, where strong horses would not drive them out, and this should be continued till the weak horses become strong, comparable

41. Arun Shourie : 'Worshipping False Gods' P-329.

to other horses. This special feedling is nothing but Reservation Policy.

Unfortunately the so called High Caste Hindus - cult of Arun Shourie - never realised this principle of reservation, rather they do not want to realise it. They do not want these lame, sick, unprivileged poor discarded people to raise and come to their level. They want that these down trodden people should always remain downtrodden. They should not come out of social, economical and intellectual slavery of Caste Hindus. They never want that the depressed class people should become the part of common stream and Hence the Caste Hindus create all sorts of obstacles in their progress. Untouchables are not selected on the pretext that suitable candidate is not found. Once they select someone, they post him to a very remote and difficult place, where other caste person would never have joined. If untouchable person still continues in the job, his confidential Reports are purposely spoiled. This is a new form of untouchability working in Government offices.

It is a common observation that in Government Machinery posts in difficult areas, thilly mountainous & remote areas are filled by depressed class people, because caste Hindus are never interested to join these difficult places. But prestigious posts, crucial posts in cities are all occupied by caste Hindus. So who is serving the poor masses living in remote hilly areas? Obviously depressed class people. This fact can be verified by anyone interested, including Mr. Shourie.

Caste Hindus have enjoyed 100% reservation by keeping other social classes miles away from education, for years together. Who has occupied the higher posts and posts of honour during British Raj obviously caste Hindus. Who is still occupying these posts of honour the caste Hindus. Recently only a few depressed class people are seen in Government

machinery and a very few at a higher posts and this is causing "Gripping Pain" to the Caste Hindus. They started decrying "Reservation beneficiary are not upto the Mark, they do not deserve the post". But same thing was uttered by the British Beaucrats, when they handed over the charge to Caste Hindus.

There is a world of difference in the modus operandi and modus vivendi of Caste Hindu employee and depressed class employee. As far as depressed class employee is concerned, there is always a fear in his mind that he would be taken to task, or a serious action would be taken against him if he does not work sincerely. Hence he works very sincerely. He is also aware that there is no lobby of executives or legislature to back him. And hence he has no alternative but to work hard. He cannot afford to loose the job as his financial position is very poor, and he is the only earning member in the family. In contrast employee from High Caste Hindu, is fully aware that there is a big lobby of executives and legislature to back him. His confidential report is never spoiled, because higher official too belongs to the cult. His financial position is usually good and more than one member in the family is in the job. Naturally he is not much dependent on the job, and do not bother much about the job, and obviously becomes careless in his job and insincere in his work.

Even in the social and political field it has been found that the members of High Caste Hindus are more involved in corrupt practices. Take an example of CRB Capital fraud, Urea fraud, Harshad Mehta scandle, M.S. Shoe scandle, St. Kitts forgery scandle, Out of turn allotment of Govt. tenements scandle, submarine purchase scandle, out of turn allotment of Petrol Pump scandle. Who are these people ? They may be any, but definitely not depressed class people. So, who is more harmful for the society ? Yes : Mr. Shourie come out.

QUIT INDIA MOVEMENT

Mr. Shourie has criticised Dr. Ambedkar a lot for not joining the so called quit India movement. To understand the movement and its achievements one has to study some past events. Let us analyse them in a methodical way. On 15th August 1936 Dr. Ambedkar established 'Independant Labour Party'.

The manifesto of the party was as follows :-

1. The party (Independant labour Party) - Hereinafter called as ILP confirms that small segments of agricultural land and increasing population are the causes of poverty in farmers. The party resorts to restart old businesses and start new one. It intends to increase productive power and capacity of people, to start technical education, and to start Govt. owned and Govt. undertaking businesses.
2. For labour class : To give them appointments, promotions, to fix salary scales and working hours, to create cheap and healthy residential places.
3. ILP would help social workers. Balance amount of the organisation would be utilised for educational purpose. For upliftment of villages, villages scheme would be implemented where in Health and Residence in villages be improved, community halls, Library etc. modern avenues would be opened up. This manifesto was highly appreciated by some English Daily.⁴²

This party was highly appreciated and also actively contributed by the then socialists including Mr. N.C. Kelkar. The party fought General elections on 17th Feb. 1937 and received a reasonable success. The organisation was growing with leaps and bounds. General Annual meeting of ILP was organised on 7th Aug. 1937, wherein Dr. Ambedkar was

42. Dhananjay Keer : *Biography of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar* P-295 (Marathi)

elected as a President & cashier. M.B. Samartha as chief secretary, Kamalakar Chitre & Upasham as secretary. Canvassing of ILP was in progress. In sept. 1937 Dr. Ambedkar delivered a lecture at Masur saying "Untouchables and labour class would not be benefited by Mr. Gandhi. Had congress been a revolutionary party, I would have joined it. But I assure you congress is not a revolutionary party. It does not give liberty and opportunity to rise at one's will..... looking at Gandhi's philosophy, a farmer would be e a third bullock."⁴³

On 17th Sept. 1937 he (Dr. Ambedkar) presented a Bill to Bombay Legislative Assembly, to eliminate 'Khoti System' in Konkan. Land workers should get the ownership of the land, was the basis of bill. But people in power (Congress) kept the bill pending.⁴⁴ He also submitted a Mahar vatan bill, that too was not cared for Dr. Ambedkar decided to present the problems of farmers to Assembly. This was a grand success Shamrao Parulekar, C.C. Joshi, D. Raut, Indulal Yadnik, A.V. Chitre met the prime minister under leadership of Dr. Ambedkar, and presented the problems of farmers., wherein they demanded fixation of Minimum wages for labourers, exemption from pending bills, and irrigation water charges to be halved.

In the mean time Parliament (Participated by Indians, and not British) introduced a Bill of 'Industrial Dispute'. Congress with its power of majority got it passed eventhough irrationally. Independant Labour Party decided to oppose the Bill. On 7th Nov. 1938 ILP & other mill organisations decided to protest this black bill by calling on one day strike. S.A. Dange, B.T. Randive, I. Yadnik supported the strike. Dr. Ambedkar said "Strike is the right of the labour to tell his owner, the conditions under which he is ready to work." If congress laders believe that liberty is pious right,

43,44. Dhananjay Keer: *Biography of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar* P-306 (Marathi)

then to strike is the pious right of labours." K.M. Munshi, Sardar Patel were keen to see that strike fails, but is succeeded. Hence congress opened fire on labourers. 72 were injured and 11 died. This was not done by any British officer but by our own Indians.⁴⁵ Indian Labour party raised the image of Dr. Ambedkar as a Labour leader, Leader of farmers, Leader of untouchables.

Very soon i.e. on 1st Sept. 1939 Germany wedged war against Poland. on 3rd Sept 1939 British Prime Minister Chamberlain declared "This country is at war with Germany". On the same day Governor General Lord Linlithgo dragged India in World war., without taking National leaders into confidence. British dragged India into a war was the notion of National leaders and as a protest they all resigned from ministry.⁴⁶

Congress Ministry who opened fire on their own Indians on 7th Nov. 1938, killing 11 and 72 injured. Mahar Vatandar bill which would have rescued Mahars from bonded labourship was not passed by congress. Bill against "Khoti system" in Konkan was made a stalemate by congress Ministry. If such a Ministry resigns, it is a "Deliverance day" but this opportunity is usurped by Mr. Jinnah" said Dr. Ambedkar. This is the real story behind the "Deliverance Day". But Shourie suppressing the deeds of congress Ministry, without giving proper reference and context painted Dr. Ambedkar as a Villain of the situation, in his book on page 8. This is the style of our learned journalist, to suppress the facts and present the remaining in a mutilated manner to achieve the goal of misunderstanding.

On 12th & 13th Feb. 1938 a conference of untouchable Railway Employees was organised at Manmad, wherein Dr. Ambedkar thundered "I was presented as an enemy of this country.

45, 46. Vimalsurya Chimankar : '*Dusare Mahayuddha Ani Dr. Ambedkar*' (Marathi) P-60 & 61 .

Now I am presented as enemy of labourers. Brahminism and capitalism are the real enemies of labourers. Brahminism does not mean power obtained by Brahmins or their special rights. What i mean by Brahminism is absence of Liberty equality and fraternity.⁴⁷ This makes it very obvious that Dr. Ambedkar by this time was well recognised labour leader, leader of farmers and leader of untouchables., and this caused a great threat to congress. For all practical purposes he became a very powerful opposition leader.

On 7th Dec. 1941 Japan attacked Pearl Harbour and world war literally reached the doors of India. On 15th Feb. 1942 Japan conquered Singapore. on 7th March 1942 Rangoon was lost and it was very evident that Japan would invade India. Obviously British Govt. was concerned. India National Congress not only kept away from war front but Mr. Subhash Chandra Bose joined hands with Germany. Realising this threat of Nazism, on 11th March 1942 British Parliament decided to send a commission to India under the chairmanship of Sir Stafford Cripps.. "Cripps Mission" reached india on 23rd March 1942. They consulted congress, Muslim league, Sikhs on Indian political dilemma for 5 days. But they did not meet or consulted Independant Labour Party. We have already seen how powerful Indipendant Labour Party had become. Is it not surprising that Mr. Cripps a Labour leader in Britain, avoids a powerful Labour party in India, in the discussions on Indian political dilemma. "Mission" declared its plan on 29th March 1942. There was complete elimination of Minority safeguard in Cripps plan. This made Dr. Ambedkar restless. On 30 March 1942. Dr. Ambedkar tried to plead the case of untouchables, but cripps cornered Dr. Ambedkar. He refused to listen Dr. Ambedkar on untouchability on the ground that he (Dr. Ambedkar) is a labour leader. He advised Dr. Ambedkar to present the case of untouchables through some casteist organisation.

47. Dhananjay Keer : *Biography of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar* P-313 (Marathi)

This attitude stunned Dr. Ambedkar. He visioned all his efforts to safeguard the interest of untouchables getting washed away. He had no option but to organise a new political party.

And thus on 18th and 19th July "All India Scheduled Caste Federation" was born. Naturally all his achievements as a labour leader, as a leader of farmers, leader of opposition were washed away. Can this be some conspiracy to reduce the image of Dr. Ambedkar ? Yes ! It was.⁴⁸ Mr. Vimalsurya Chimankar suspects a conspiracy. He writes Sir Stafford Cripps was instrumental to mend the mind of Stalin in favour of Friends Alliance. He (Cripps) came to India in 1939 to study Indian Politics. From 7th - 10th Dec. 1939 he was a guest of Mr. Gandhi at Wardha. During that time he tried to persuade Mr. Jinnah, not to celebrate "Deliverance Day". He tried to minimise the differences between league and congress. In all this envoyship he developed cordial relations with Gandhi, Nehru, Patel and Jinnah. So there is reason to believe that Sir stafford Cripp's mind was muddled by congress against Ambedkar.

With all its efforts and events ultimately Congress refused "Cripps Plan" on 11th April 1942. The two additional demands made by congress were 1) Defence Ministry to be held by Indians. 2) Vice Roy should not have veto power against parliamentary decisions. These demands raised suspicion in the minds of British and on the top of it Japan declared India as a sovereign state on 16th Feb. 1942. All this culminated in failure of Cripps Mission.⁴⁹

Failure of Cripps Mission put the National leaders in a dilemma. Till this time the congress was against helping the British. Now in 1942 they cant pretend to support British, so at least they will have to show their opposition to British,

48, 49. Vimalsurya Chimankar : '*Dusare Mahayuddha Ani Dr. Ambedkar*' (Marathi) P-65 & 67.

and this move of opposing the British at this juncture would help and favour the revolutionary group. And possibly all credit would go to revolutionary group and Gandhis image as "Ahimsa Wadi" would have tarnished. Mr. Gandhi was in a great dilemma., rather utter frustration. In this mental status of frustration congress working comittee meeting was organised at Wardha and decision of "Quit India" movement was taken.⁵⁰ Resolution passed in this meeting in worth noting. "British should leave the country but keep army in India itself for protection against Japanese invasion.

"Our leaders hail the 1942 "Quit India" movement as a giant & decisive stride towards Freedom.⁵¹ Slogan of "do or die" was given by Mr. Gandhi. But nothing of the sort happened. Not a single congress leader had a working plan for this agitation. K.M. Munshi syas "No doubt Gandhiji did not have any plan for this agitation, but it was equally so with revolutionary group of Mr. Jayprakash Narayan who claims its progress. Some call it "August revolution". Are revolutions like this, without any planning.⁵²

On 8th Aug. 1942, at midnight all prominent congress leaders were arrested and put to jail. Jayprakash Narayan took over the charge of quit India movement. Due to arrest of Gandhi & Nehru, agitated mob crowded on the road. Breakdown of Railway Station, Breakdown of electical poles. to cut the telephone wires were the activities taken by this angry mob. At places meetings were conducted in peace but at majority of places there was violence. At many places there was Armed Violence. From oct. 42 to Dec. 42 British Govt. opened fire for 538 times. 940 people were killed & 1630 injured. 60,000 were arrested and 18000 imprisoned. By the end of 1942 this agitation/ revotuion came to an

50,52. V.Chimankar: '*Dusare Mahayuddha Ani Dr. Ambedkar*' P.128-129 & 133.

51. Arun Shourie : '*Worshipping False Gods*' P-63.

end without any significant achievement. British govt. suppressed the August Kranti. Jayprakash Narayan explained the reasons of his failure in his secret bulletin "To the freedom fighters" wherein he says -

- 1) A nation wide powerful revolution was not organised.
- 2) The public was not given any post revolution programme.
- 3) No attempt was made to sow seed of revolution in Indian Army & revolutionary group⁵³.

With all regards and respect to the Martyrs of quit India movement, one thing is sure, this agitation did not progress an inch towards indepedance of India.

This is the same National Movement which Shourie says culminated in Independance of India. It is the same "Quit India" movement which was discarded by Muslims, untouchables, Sikhs, Anglo-Indians, Christians. Not the least but Communists of India, Mr. V.D. Sawarkar and Mr. C. Rajgopalachari. I do not underestimate the efforts of participants. I do not doubt the sincerity. But Shourie has no right to call a National Leader as Anti-national only because he did not participate in this movement. There was a group of social workers who never participated in quit India movement. If Shourie wants to use the same yard sticks to other leaders who did not participate in 1942 movement like Shamaprasad Mukharjee or Dr. Hedgewar, possibly I have no objection. One question can be asked ? When "Quit India" movement was in full swing Dr. Ambedkar was a member of Executive Council of Vice Roy. Inspite of this fact Dr. Ambedkar give shelter to Achutrao Patwardhan - a revolutionary congressman in wanted 'List of British.' - Is this a national or anti national work Mr. Shourie ?

53. Vimalsurya Chimankar : '*Dusare Mahayuddha Ani Dr. Ambedkar*' (Marathi) P-131.

Then what are the factors which culminated in Independance of India. These are as follows :-

- 1) Britain spent Rs. 14 Crores every day in war period. This dilapidated the economic condition of Britain.
- 2) Britain was not willing to spend more money to quash Indian agitations, in future.⁵⁴
- 3) Pressure from revolutionary group of India.
- 4) Possibly changing outlook towards colonisation.

All these things were foreseen by Dr. Ambedkar and he declared as early as 27th July 1942 i.e. before joining the executive council of vice Roy "Gandhiji's Do or die movment is irresponsible and insane. It reflects Gandhi's bankruptcy and is just an attempt to recover for the congress prestige which it has lost in the preceeding two years. It would be madness, to weaken the law and order when barbarian were at the gates to sieze the mastery over the country."⁵⁵ Regarding India and its Independance, British are fighting in the last trench. If democratic principles win no one can prevent India from becoming Independant.⁵⁶

Every Now and then Shourie asked the question, Where was Dr. Ambedkar in 1942 ; what was he doing ? Why he did not join "Quit India" movement is clear from the above discussion. What he was doing in this period would be clear from the following discussion.

Dr. Ambedkar was Seer, who could see through the curtain of time. He realised the disaster of World war very early and declared the support of his party, unconditionally, to Britain, on 12th Sept. 1939. He was not the one who would care for his own house, when the whole city is burning. He declared "The Independant Labour Party supports the appeal made by His Excellancy the Viceroy of India to help

54,56. V. Chimankar : *'Dusare Mahayuddha Ani Dr. Ambedkar'* P-179 & 180.

55. Arun Shourie : *'Worshipping False Gods'* P-82.

Britain in this war. The Independant Labour Party agrees that this is no time for making conditions. At the same time Independant Labour Party believes that the British as well as Indians should know and understand what they are fighting for and what they expect of each other."⁵⁷ Is this not an eye opener for the dwarfs like shourie, that he was fully aware of the situation. He wanted to help British for fighting against the Nazism, but at the sametime he warns the British, that expectations of Indians need to be fulfilled after the war. Such an understanding and statemanship was not seen in any other so called National Leader of that time.

On 19th July 1942 at Nagpur he says, "This World war is between Nazism and Democracy. This Nazism is not based on any moral footing. It has created a threat to the future of mankind. You should word hard to prevent extinction of democracy which is a bond-link between man and man. Hence depressed class people should fight to conserve the Democracy."⁵⁸ He did not stop here. He persuaded British Govt. to recruit Mahar youths in British Army. This approach of Dr. Ambedkar was highly appreciated on international scene. A professor from oxford university interrogated Dr. Ambedkar in 1939, and the discussions are published in his book "Enlist India for Freedom". Dr. Ambedkar had expressed his concern for the future of Human Race in this discussion.⁵⁹

He had a clear idea as to what can happen if Germany or Japan wins the war. In 1940 he says "If Japan or Germany wins India, Indians will have to lead the life like animals. British did injustices to Indians but there is some freedom to agitate or contradict. In German dictatorship you can't get even this freedom. After Independance India would definitely get additional rights but to acquire them all Indian Parties should join war front, to help ourself."⁶⁰ His article in Janta

57, 58, 59, 60. V. Chimankar : 'Dusare Mahayuddha Ani Dr. Ambedkar' (Marathi) P-153, 152, 156 & 159.

published on 9 Nov. 1940 is a masterpiece of his intelligence his fore sight, his concern for democratic principles. His concern aroused out of world war and his message for the Communists of India and Russia, projects his image as a very tall International figure, a seer who could see beyond the curtain of time. This also explains his approach to help the British during the world war period, and thus he figures out most prominently on the International Canvass.

Mr. Shourie is an example of how a journalist should not be. This can be proved by following example. Dr. Ambedkar in his book "What congress and Gandhi have done to untouchables" expressed his opinions freely explaining the position of congress, position of untouchables clearly in the chapter titled "A false charge". Shourie in his book copied the whole chapter on pages 10 & 11, presenting Dr. Ambedkar as British agent. But purposefully omitted few paras in the same chapter, For example last para. This last para is very important to prove the balance mind of Dr. Ambedkar, to prove that Dr. Ambedkar was not a British agent. For the ease of readers I am reproducing the para omitted by Shourie. "The untouchables do not say that they are out to under write the declarations made by the British Govt. They do not say that if Indians are agreed it must necessarily be a case of "Knock and it will open, Ask and it shall be given into you" They admit that British may not act upto the declarations they have made. It may be that even when an agreed constitution is produced, they may not act upon their promises and a fight for freedom may become necessary. The untouchables do not overlook these possibilities. But what the do say is that the Indians have not put the British to the Test. They cant be put to the test unless they are presented with an agreed constitution. So long as the Congress does not adopt this course as the first though it may not be the last line of action, the untouchables feel that the congress is not honest in its dealing with them, not even to the country. Who can say that the untouchables have not sufficient justification for refusing to

participate in the Congress "Fight for freedom".⁶¹

Now detach this para & attach it to the last statement given in Shourie's book and read again. You will find altogether different meaning and intensions of Dr. Ambedkar than what Shourie has presented. This is his research. This is his honesty. Possibly he forgot the statement of Mr. Gandhi. "A false that looks like the truth is the worst kind of lie."

Suppression of facts, mutilations of facts, distortions of facts, drawing wrong conclusions, drawing distorted conclusions are the basic features of the cult Shourie belongs. I would like to give a simile. Socrates was delivering a lecture on moral principles. And there was a great good gathering. A demon was there sitting on the last bench. After the lecture all audience greeted socrates for his marvalous piece of lecture. Lastly demon came and greeted socretes. Socrates recognised the Demon and asked him the reason of attending the lecture. Demon replied "Now I know what to avoid". Worshipping False gods is written, by sitting on that last bench.

It is really astonishing that statements of Dr. Ambedkar proved to be correct with the passage of time. His statement that agreed constitution be prepared & British would leave this country proved beyond doubt. British left this country even before completing the constitution. His statement on page 14 regarding Bania is true even today. To quote a few, what is this Harshad Mehta scandle, CRB capital scandle. Also see the adulteration of bloting paper in curd, adulteration of stones in wheat and Rice. Does not this prove his statement.

One more example of misinterpretation. Shourie presented that Dr. Ambedkar was interested in tying the New Government with British Crown by a Treaty called "Minority Treaty". Reader is requested to go through these

61. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : '*Writing and Speeches*', Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. IX, P- 180.

paras in a minute details and he would realise that it is other way round. Dr. Ambedkar outright rejected the concept of "Minority Treaty."

Secretary of the State for India, Mr. L.S. Amery & Sir D. Monteanth noted in their minutes on 2nd March 1942 *"The scheduled castes are dispersed all over the country. Therefore their only hope lies in the provision that the constitution making body shall negotiate a treaty with the British Govt. in all matters affected by the Transfer of British to Indian hands."*⁶² This clearly indicates who was interested for the treaty.

"I was greatly interested to read Ambedkar's further memorandum on the Cripps proposal. Amery wrote to Linlithgow 'Logically his criticism is I fear unanswerable'. It is true that at first glance treaties can't protect minorities. Amery conceded, but there are ways around that. Protection given to minorities by a treaty may be very illusory thing."⁶³ So even Amery too agreed to the criticism given by Dr. Ambedkar on Minority treaty. Dr. Ambedkar's opinion on this treaty is very clear on page 69 of Shourie's book. Governor of Bombay Presidency, Sir R. Lumley writing to Viceroy Linlithgow"..... The exception to which I had referred is Ambedkar. He came to see me to discuss the establishment of the National War front and although he was with enthusiasm agreed to give it some support he took the opportunity to let off to me some very bitter steam about the draft declaration. He said that he had been as good as told that Congress and Muslim League were the only bodies which counted and that if they agreed to the proposals it would not matter what he or the depressed classes thought about them. He professed to be bitterly disillusioned & to feel humiliated. He declared that the proposals went back on the August Declaration and that with the example of Irish Treaty before him, the suggestion

62. Arun Shourie : 'Worshipping False Gods' P-44.

63. Arun Shourie : 'Worshipping False Gods' P-47.

that the minorities could be safe fuarded by means of a treaty was a very poor joke.⁶⁴

This very clearly proves that Minority treaty was not his creation. Nor he believed it. Rather he criticised it. inspite of this shourie presents that Minority treaty was Ambedkar's creation. Is it not a proof that Shourie has lost the faculty of reasoning. Is it not a proof that he cannot draw correct meaning and logical conclusions., and he is on the verge of breaking. There are many more examples like this which prove his departure from intellegesia.

Few readers may still believe that Dr. Ambedkar was 'a British Agent'. All such misbeliefs would melt away if readers go through his speech given in Round Table Conference on 20th Nov. 1930. Here are few excerpts.⁶⁵ "..... We have judged of the existing administration solely in the light of our own circumstances and we have found it wanting in some of the most essential elements of a good government. When we compare our present position with the one which it was our lot to bear in Indian society of the pre-British days, we find that, instead of marching on, we are only marking time, Before the British, we were in the loathsome condition due to our untouchability. Has the British Government done anything to remove it ? Before the British, we could not enter the temple. Can we enter now ? Before the British, we were denied entry into the Police force. does the British Government admit us in the Force ? Before the British, we were not allowed to serve in the Military. Is that career now open to us ? To none of these questions can we give an affirmative answer. That the British, who have held so large a sway over us for such a long time, have done some good we cheerfully acknowledge. But there is certainly no fundamental change in our position. Indeed, so far as we were concerned, the British Government has accepted the social arrangements as

64. Arun Shourie : *'Worshipping False Gods'* P-69.

65. Proceedings of the Round Table Conference (First Session) Govt. of India, Central Publication Branch, Calcutta, 1931, PP. 123-129.

it found them, and has preserved them faithfully in the manner of the Chinese tailor who, when given an old coat as a pattern, produced with pride an exact replica, rents, patches and all. Our wrongs have remained as open sores and they have not been righted, although 150 years of British rule have rolled away.

We do not accuse the British of indifference or want of sympathy. What we do find is that they are quite incompetent to tackle our problems. If the case was one of indifference only it would have been a matter of small moment, and it would not have made such a profound change in our attitude. But what we have come to realise on a deeper analysis of the situation is that it is not merely a case of indifference, rather it is a case of sheer incompetence to undertake the task. The depressed classes find that the British Government in India suffers from two very serious limitations. There is first of all an internal limitation which arises from the character, motives and interests of those who are in power. It is not because they cannot help us in these things but because it is against their character, motives and interests to do so. The second consideration that limits its authority is the mortal fear it has of external resistance. The government of India does realise the necessity of removing the social evils which are eating into the vitals of Indian society and which have blighted the lives of the downtrodden classes for so many years. The Government of India does realise that the landlords are squeezing the masses dry, and the capitalists are not giving the labourers a living wage and decent conditions of work. Yet it is most painful thing that it has not dared to touch any of these evils. Why ? Is it because it has no legal powers to remove them ? No. The reason why it does not intervene is because it is afraid that its intervention to amend the existing code of social and economic life, will give rise to resistance. Of What good is such a Government to anybody ? Under a Government, paralysed between two such limitations, much that goes to make life good must remain held up. We must have a Government in which the men in power will give their undivided allegiance to the best interest of the country. We must have a Government in which men in power, knowing where obedience will end and resistance will begin, will not be afraid to amend the social and economic code of life which the dictates of justice and expediency so urgently call for. This

ROLE the British Government will never be able to play. It is only a Government which is of the people, for the people and by the people that will make this possible.

These are some of the questions raised by the Depressed Classes and the answer which in their view these questions seem to carry. This is therefore the inevitable conclusion which the Depressed Classes have come to : namely, that the bureaucratic Government of India, with the best of motives, will remain powerless to effect any change so far as our particular grievances are concerned. We feel that nobody can remove our grievances as well as we can, and we cannot remove them unless we get political power in our own hands. No share of this political power can evidently come to us so long as the British Government remains as it is. It is only in a Swaraj constitution that we stand any chance of getting the political power into our own hands, without which we cannot bring salvation to our people.....

".....There is one point with which I should like to deal before I close this matter. We are often reminded that the problem of the Depressed Classes is a social problem and that its solution lies elsewhere than in politics. We take strong exception to this view. We hold that the problem of the Depressed Classes will never be solved unless they get political power in their own hands. If this is true, and I do not think that the contrary can be maintained, then problem of Depressed Classes is I submit eminently a political problem and must be treated as such. We know that Political power is passing from the British into the hands of those who wield such tremendous economic, social and religious sway over our existence. We are willing that it may happen, though the idea of Swaraj recalls to the mind of many of us the tyrannies, oppressions and injustices practised upon us in the past and fear of their recurrence under Swaraj. We are prepared to take the inevitable risk of the situation in the hope that we shall be installed, in adequate proportion, as the political sovereigns of the country along with our fellow countrymen. But we will consent to that on one condition and that is that the settlement of our problems is not left to time. I am afraid the Depressed Classed have waited too long for time to work its miracle. At every successive step taken by the British Government to widen the scope of representative Government

the Depressed Classes have been systematically left out. No thought has been given to their claim for political power. I protest with all the emphasis I can that we will not stand this any longer. The settlement of our problem must be a part of the general political settlement and must not be left over to the shifting sands of the sympathy and goodwill of the rulers of the future.....

".....I am sorry Mr. President. I had to speak in such plain words. But I saw no help. The Depressed Classes have had no friend. The Government has all along used them only as an excuse for its continued existence. The Hindus claim them only to deny or, better still, to appropriate rights. The Muhammadans refuse to recognize their separate existence, because they fear that their privileges may be curtailed by the admission of a rival. Depressed by the Government, suppressed by the Hindu and disregarded by the Muslim, we are left in a most intolerable position of utter helplessness to which I am sure there is no parallel and to which I was bound to call attention.....

".....The worth and efficacy of this advice you all knew. You did not listen to it and you lost the great continent of America. You followed it to the lasting good of yourself and the rest of the Dominions that are with you. To such of you as are willing to adopt a policy of conciliation I should like to say one thing. There seems to be prevalent an impression that the Delegates are called here to argue for and against a case for Dominion Status and that the grant of Dominion Status will be dependent upon which side is the victor in this battle of wits. With due deference to all who are sharpening their wits, I submit that there can be no greater mistake than to make the formula of logic govern so live an issue. I have no quarrel with logic and logicians. But I warn them against the disaster that is bound to follow if they are not careful in the selection of the premises they choose to adopt for their deductions. It is all a matter of temper whether you will abide by the fall of your logic, or whether you will refute it, as Dr. Johnson did the paradoxes of Berkeley by trampling them under his feet. I am afraid it is not sufficiently realised that in the present temper of the country, no constitution will be workable which is not acceptable to the majority of the people. The time when you were to choose and India was to accept is gone, never to return. Let the consent of the people

nd not the accident of logic be the touchstone of your new constitution, if you desire that it should be worked."

Any doubt about the sense of Nationality, any doubt about his patriotism? Yes Mr. Shourie!



DR. AMBEDKAR - A MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF VICEROY

Writer has spent 16 pages on reproducing the letters written to & fro Viceroy and Governor as 'Secret, Private & Personal'. I do not know what writer wanted to achieve by this. But he has definitely wasted the time of readers without giving them anything fruitful. In short Shourie was not happy on Dr. Ambedkar's inclusion in the executive council of Viceroy.

Ambedkar did not join executive council for his personal gains. Lest, a highly educated scholar of his calibre would have easily got a post of fabulous salary, in that period. But he wanted to do something for his people. Secondly he was not the only Indian in the executive council of Viceroy. There were many other Indians. But Shourie has all his wrath on Ambedkar only, and no one else. On this background let us see what Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya wants to say. Here we must remember that Mr. Lohiya was a contemporary freedom fighter. *"Nehru was potentially favourable to support the British War front in 1942 and this belief of mine is confirmed after reading the book written by (Maulana) Azad."*

*Nehru was willing to co-operate British. He was desirous to join the extended executive council of Viceroy. In spite of the fact that India was not given any assurance of freedom after war."*⁶⁶

66. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya : *'Bhartiya Falniche Gunhegar'* (Marathi) P-29.

This means Mr. Nehru was mentally prepared to join Executive Council, obviously leaving aside 1942 "Quit India" movement. Possibly certain pressures prevented him from doing so. YES MR. SHOURIE WHAT DO YOU SAY ?

Then writer has again spent few pages on discussions of Governor of Bombay Mr. Lumley and the Viceroy. Through out these letters there appears to be one man, who had a bad opinion about Dr. Ambedkar. He was a Governor of Bombay, a Bombay where brahmnical influence was high. So the possibility of polluting the mind of Mr. Lumley by Caste Hindus cannot be ruled out. like that of Sir. Stafford Cripps.

Every now & then writer has asked "What Dr. Ambedkar was doing in 1942." Obviously he was in Executive Council of Viceroy. Let us now see what did he there.

Members of the executive council of Viceroy were :-

1. A. Ramaswami Mudliar.
2. E.C. Benthall
3. M.D. Usman
4. B.R. Ambedkar
5. J.P. Shrivastava
6. M. Azizul Haque
7. Ashok K. Roy
8. J.A. Thorne
9. A. Hyadari

Out of all only Dr. Ambedkar is a sore point for Shourie.

Inspite of all his criticism if one cares to see what Dr. Ambedkar had done in the executive council, possibly he would agree that whatever he has done is nothing but a service to the Nation. For the ease of readers I would like to quote some of his work.

DAMODAR VALLEY SCHEME ⁶⁷

Calcutta Conference :-

"The Govt. of India is very much alive to the disadvantages arising from the present state of affair and wishes to take steps to evolve a policy which will utilise the water resources of the country to the best advantage of everybody and to put our water resources to the purpose which they are made to serve in other countries." Observed the Honourable Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Labour Member Govt. of India, in his address to representatives of the central, Bengal and Bihar Governments at a conference held in the Bengal Secretariat, in Calcutta on January 3 to consider means and methods for developing Damodar valley.

Here is the full text of Dr. Ambedkar's speech :

On behalf of Govt. of India I thank you for having agreed to hold this meeting at such short notice and at considerable personal inconvenience to yourselves. The purpose of this meeting is to consider means and methods for giving effects to the proposal of the Damodar River Flood Enquiry Committee appointed by the Govt. of Bengal in 1944. Before I proceed further, it is only proper that I should congratulate the Govt. of Bengal on the appointment of this committee. I must also pay my tribute to the committee for the very sound views they have expressed both on particular problem of dealing with floods in the Damodar River and on the General Problem of the best utilisation of water resources of the country.

Comittee's Recommendations :

..... the comittee have suggested that the project of damming the Damodar should have as its purpose not merely stopping the flood but also include the generation of electricity and supply of water for irrigation It is not far from truth to say that so far there had been an absence of positive all India policy for the development of water ways. Secondly there has not been enough realisation that our policy for water

67. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. X, P. 220-224.

ways must be a multi purpose policy so as to include the provision for irrigation, electrification and navigation.

Railways and Waterways :

Irrigation has been the only purpose of our waterways policy. Further we have not sufficient account of the fact that there is no difference between Railways and Waterways, and if Railways cannot be subjected to provincial boundries, neither can water ways, at any rate those that flow from province to province. On the contrary we have allowed our constitution to make a distinction between Railways and Waterways with the result that railways are treated as central but waterways are treated as provincial.

The disadvantages of this error are many and obvious. To give one illustration, a province needs electricity and wishes to utilise its water resources for the purpose but it cannot do so because the point at which water can be dammed lies in another province which being agricultural does not need electricity and has no interest in it, or money to finance the project, And would not allow the needy province to use the site. Complain as much as we like a province can take such an unfriendly attitude and justify it in the name of Provincial Autonomy. Remember Kaveri water problem being discussed today -

Utilisation of water resources :

I have made these observations with a two fold purpose. Against this background you are in a better position to evaluate the recommendations of the Damodar River Flood Enquiry Comittee, appointed by the Bengal Govt. to which I have made a particular reference. My second purpose is to tell you that the Govt. of India is very much alive to the disadvantages arising from the present state of affairs and wishes to take steps to envolve a policy which will utilise the water resources of the country to the best advantage of everyone & to put our water resources to the purpose which they are made to serve in other countries.

A revision of the constitution treating waterways on the same footing as the railways will no doubt be a very welcome change. But the Govt. of India does not think it necessary to wait till such constitutional changes come into being. Nor does the Govt. thinks that, if the provinces

show the will to co-operate in a joint project for the utilisation of water resources, the difficulties created by the constitution will stand in their way.

The Govt. of India has very much in its mind the Tennessee Valley Scheme operating in the United States. They are studying the scheme and feel that something along that line can be done in India if the provinces offer their co-operation and agree to override provincial barrier which has held up so much of their progress and their prosperity. As a preliminary step for securing the best use of the water resources of the country, the Govt. of India has created a central organisation - called central Technical Power Board, and are contemplating to create another to be called the central Waterways, Irrigation & Navigation commission.....

MULTI PURPOSE PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ORISSA RIVERS.⁶⁸

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's speech at Cuttak

"Orissa wants to get rid of evils of floods. Orissa wants to get rid of Malaria and other - to use American phraseology - 'low income' diseases causing ill health and corroding the stamina of her people. Orissa wants to raise the standard of living of her people and advance their prosperity by irrigation, by navigation and by producing cheap electrical power. All these purposes can fortunately be achieved by one single plan, namely to build reservoirs and store the water which is flowing in her rivers." Thus observed the Hon'ble Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Labour Member to the Govt. of India in his Presidential address at the conference held in Cuttack on Nov. 8, between the representatives of central Govt. and the Govt. of Orissa, to discuss the possibilities of developing Orissa rivers.

Referring to the problem of Orissa, the Labour Member observed : "To say that the problem is one of floods is both an over simplification and an understatement of the problem. I see the problem in somewhat different light. When I think of Orissa, the picture that comes to mind is that of people subject not to one affliction, but many.

68. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. X, P- 302.

One such affliction, which is on the lips of everybody is the constant exposure of her people to the floods which cause damage to life and property and in a general sense, insecurity. This affliction is due, not merely to floods, but also to draughts and famines, Damage by draughts and famines can be as great as that caused by floods. It is said that in the draught of 1866, nearly 40% of the population of Puri district perished. Deterioration in health is another affliction of the people of Orissa. The total population of Orissa is 77,1/2 lakhs. According to the health report of the province, the total deaths in 1944 were 2,35,581. Of these 1,30,000 died from some kind of fever and a majority by malarial fever. This means that three percent of her population died in 1944, and of these nearly half died of Malaria. This is a very high figure. In 1944, 19% of the student population was found to show distinct signs of Malnutrition and 8.7% showed signs of vitamin deficiency. If these facts are true, Orissa cannot be said to be above the poverty line. The third affliction of Orissa - I think it would be called an affliction - is its want of internal communication. Orissa is a locked up country. Except for solitary railway line, running along her eastern sea coast, there is no means of communication either by railways or by canal to connect the vast hinterland with the sea coast.

Should Orissa continue to be in such a wretched state as it is today ? It need not. It has natural resources, and they are by no means meagre. Orissa has coal, Orissa has iron, chrome, graphite, bauxite, limestone, mica and Orissa has bamboo, to mention only few of its important natural resources. There is another precious possession which Orissa has, namely her water wealth. The amount of water that passes through the Orissa delta is just vast. The delta comprising roughly the three districts of Cuttack, Puri and Balasore and covering the area of about 8000 square miles is traversed by a network of distributaries arising mainly from three rivers, the Mahanadi, the Brahmani, and the Baitarani. Given the resources, why has Orissa continued to be so poor, so backward and so wretched a province ? The only answer I can give is that Orissa has not found the best method of utilising her water wealth. Much effort has undoubtedly been spent in inquiring into the question of floods..... With all respects to the members of these enquiry committees, I am sorry to say

they did not bring the right approach to bear on the problem. They were influenced by the ideal that water in excessive quantity was an evil., that when water comes in excessive quantity, what needs to be done is to let it run into the sea in an orderly flow. Both these views are now regarded as grave misconceptions, as positively dangerous from the point of view of the good of people.

Conservation of water :-

"It is wrong to think water in excessive quantity is an evil. Water can never be so excessive as to be an evil. Man suffers more from lack of water than from excess of it. The trouble is that the nature is not only niggardly in the amount of water it gives, it is also erratic in its distribution-alternating between draught and storm. But this cannot alter the fact that water is wealth. Water being wealth of people and its distribution being uncertain, the correct approach is not to complain against nature but to conserve the water. If conservation of water is mandatory from the point of view of public good, then obviously the plan of embankment is a wrong plan. It is a mean which does not subserve the end, namely conservation of water and must therefore be abandoned. Orissa delta is not the only area where there is so much amount of water and there is so much amount of evil proceeding from that water. The U.S.A. had the same problem to face. Orissa must therefore adopt the methods which the U.S.A. adopted in dealing with the problems of its rivers. That method is to dam rivers at various points to conserve water permanently in reservoirs. There are many purposes which such reservoirs can serve besides irrigation. I am told that if it were possible to store the entire run off of the Mahanadi, it will be enough to irrigate thereby a million acres, provided that much area was available. Water stored in the reservoirs can be used for generating electrical power. If in the midst of its natural resources, Orissa has remained an industrially undeveloped area, it is due to want of cheap power to run its factories. Here there will be abundance of electric power, more than Orissa can hope to consume for a long time to come. Another use to which this water can be put to is navigation. Navigation in India has had a very chequered history. During the rule of East India Company, Provision for internal navigation occupied a very prominent part in the

public works budget of the Company's Govt. Many of the navigation canals we have in India today are remnant of that policy. Railway came later, and for a time the policy was to have both railway and central navigation. By 1875 there arose a great controversy in which the issue was railway verses canals. The battle for canals was fought bravely by the late Sir Aurthur cotton - one of the few engineers with big ideas. Unfortunately supporters of railways won.

I am not quite happy about this victory of railways over canals. Much more annoying is the ignorant opinion of the supporters of Railways that canals must go because they do not pay without knowing that if the canals do not pay it is not because they cannot pay, but because their capacity to pay has been terribly mutilated by leaving them uncompleted. I am sure that internal navigation cannot be neglected in the way in which it has been in the past. We ought to borrow a leaf from Germany and Russia in this matter and not only revive reconstructions of our old canals but make new ones also and not to sacrifice them to the exigencies of railways."⁶⁹

This is what Dr. Ambedkar was doing in the executive council of Viceroy of India. Is this a Anti-National work Mr. Shourie ? By using your parameters you may say this is an anti-national work. Lot many examples can be given like this, which prove the service rendered by Dr. Ambedkar to the Nation even when he was in executive council. I will stop after giving one more example.

LABOUR MEMBERS VISITS COAL MINES ⁷⁰

The Hon'ble Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Member for Labour, Govt. of India arrived at Dhanbad on Thursday, Dec. 9 to study working conditions in the coal fields. Among those present to receive him were a number of local officials, including Mr. S.N. Muzumdar, Labour Commissioner Bihar, and Mt. W. Kirby, Chief Inspector of Mines and representatives of

69, 70. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: '*Writing and Speeches*', Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. X, P- 302, 130 to 133.

various mining Associations and colliery owners. Mr. H.C. Prior, Secretary, Labour Department and Mr. R.S. Nimkar, Labour Welfare Advisor to the Govt. of India arrived early in the day.

Immediately after arrival the Labour Member accompanied by the chief Inspector of Mines, colliery owners, Mr. Prior and Mr. Nimkar drove to Bhulanbararee Colliery. The representatives of workers, Mr. Karnik, representative of Indian Federation of labour, and Miss Shanta Bhall Rao, representing the All India Trade Union Congress, also accompanied the party., to study the working conditions in coal mine. The programme included inspection of both surface and underground conditions of work.

400 Feet underground :

Wearing the 'safety hats' very much resembling well known Army tin hats in shape the labour member and the party went 400 feet underground in two batches where they saw workers cutting coal. There were some women workers who had been recently employed in the colliery as a result of the removal of prohibition on employment of women in mines. The Labour Member, Mr. Nimbalkar and others in the party asked the workers a number of questions concerning their wages and earnings.

At another state during the inspection of Bhulanbararee Colliery, the party saw stowing operation in progress. During the course of surface inspection Dr. Ambedkar had a friendly chat with workers regarding their wages and earnings.

The Labour Member then proceeded to the worker's quarters in the vicinity of the colliery. "Hum ander a sakate hain"-with these polite words in Hindustani the labour member took permission of the occupants to enter their houses, which was readily given. He inspected the furniture and other contents of the house and looked around to see the ventilation

arrangement.

The party were taken to a well equipped and cleanly kept hospital, maintained by the owner of this colliery, where the labour member chatted with few indoor patients. He was also taken round a special ward for woman workers.

At Workers Colony :

..... The programme for the day included inspection of the Tisra colliery. The inspection began with the examination of rates of wages paid by employers of the colliery to workers. It was late in the evening when the party came out to make surface inspection of the colliery. The workers were leisurely returning to their homes, carrying spades, pickaxes and Kerosene safety lamps. The labour member thus had an opportunity of seeing workers & their women folk preparing their evening meals. He was very keen on acquainting himself with the quantity and nature of food available to and consumed by workers. At the Tisra colliery, he also saw a few quarries where men and women were doing surface work.

Visit to Ranjiganj Coalfields :

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar and party devoted Friday to study working conditions and methods of coal production in some Raniganj coalfields. The inspection began with an examination of the arrangement being made proprietors of the Shivapur Colliery for the welfare and medical care of their miners. The party were taken around a quadrangular single storied white hospital building containing modern X-Ray equipment and other surgical apparatus. It was learnt that the hospital would start working shortly.

Later in the day, the labour member was taken to leper welfare centre, where leprosy in its early stages can effectively be treated. Dr. Ambedkar also visited a small compact building accomodating a baby welfare centre where he saw frail bodied children of miners, who were being looked after

by aais. The labour Member expressed appreciation of these welfare efforts but asked why the children were frail and rickeetty. He was told that it was due to deficiency of nutritive food.

School of Miners Children :

Winding their way along the road to Sitapur colliery, the party visited a primary school where workers children garlanded Dr. Ambedkar. Earlier in the day the party inspected the Sodhapur stowing plant - A huge mechanical structure drawing 200 Tonnes of sand per hour, from Damodar basin in the vicinity and conveyed to the mines by automatic rope ways. The party also inspected underground conditions of work in Sitapur Colliery. They descended about 1000 feet and saw coal being raised by upto date coal cutting machine.

On the way back to Dhanbad the labour member visited the "dhowras" (one room tenements) in the workers colony at the Begunia colliery. The rooms were dark and, in one case, a calf, lazily chewing dry grass, was seen in the small varanda sharing with the inmates their scanty accomodation. Dr. Ambedkar chatted with the inmates. It was learnt that workers get coal free of charge, in sufficient quantities for domestic use. He made further inquires regarding food, clothing and health of workers.....

This was the work done by Dr. Ambedkar as a member of the executive council of Vice Roy. Wherever he went wherever he visited he was always concerned about the poor, unprevilaged. Even today the Ministers of labour, in independant India do not bother and dare to enter 1000 feet down to earth, so see the working conditions of labours. Nobody bothers to look, under what conditions workers live. During that period Dr. Ambedkar did all this work. He worked hard to solve the flood and famine problem of Orissa But Alas! This is a antinational work, because Mr. Shourie thinks it so. I think I need not give any more examples of

the work done by Dr. Ambedkar as a labour Member in the executive council of ViceRoy. And I am more than sure that he served the Nation in much better way than any one else.

But Shourie's eye's can't see all these things. Because his eyes are in search of negative side, negative thing & that is why Shourie has raised the question of M.N. Roy, a secretary of Indian Labour federation. Shourie has presented that Dr. Ambedkar was misguiding the house an the issue . Actually it was a move to boost the morale of Labours. All the concerned Labour Unions were summoued. But only Indian Labour federation responded. Mr. M.N. Roy was a sincere devoted worker. He started his revolutionary work from the age of 13 & was close to Jatin Das. later he worked in Mexico, Russia and China. Shourie is trying to paint him like todays leaders & politicians. Had he eaten that money he would have lead a lavish life. But this was not found V.B. Karnik & close associates of Roy have published a booklet "Rupees thirteen thousand controversy X-rayed". In this booklet details of expenditure of that money is given. It is better for Shourie to read the booklet - Regarding Jamnadas Mehta for a large time he was in philedelphia and unaware about development in india. When he came back to India, after realising the fact he decided to clear the matter by publishing a pamphlet but before that he joined a Govt. service and resigned from president's post of federation. (Govinda Talwalkar)



DR. AMBEDKAR AS PRINCIPAL ARCHITECT of CONSTITUTION of India

Writer has given an exhaustive, extensive account of Constituent Assembly Debates, account of lectures given in constituent assembly and array of his opinions. Conclusions drawn by him are as follows :-

1. Dr. Ambedkar is not the Principle architect of the Constitution of India.
2. Sir B.N. Rau - a constitutional expert - is the one who has done a major work.
3. If Dr. Ambedkar is the author of constitution, why he expressed that he would burn it ?

* Dr. Ambedkar has included in the constitution many things from Govt. of India act, 1935, and from constitutions of other countries.

* If Dr. Ambedkar is the author of the constitution, why amendments were there.

Many of the amendments changed the original article radically. Then how Dr. Ambedkar is writer of our constitution.

* Many of the times Dr. Ambedkar has left the decision to the constituent assembly.

He has flown in the direction of discussion. How can he be writer of constitution ?

* There were many members in the constituent Assembly and Drafting committee who has contributed in the formation

of constitution, then how can Dr. Ambedkar be the only writer of the constitution ?

All these childish questions of Mr. Shourie would be answered in due course of discussion. Before I start, I would like to bring to the notice of readers, that exactly the same questions were raised by a Marathi writer Mr. Y.D. Phadke few years back. And I have categorically answered all his queries in my book "Fule-Ambedkar Sanshodhanatil Pradushane" in marathi language, published in Dec. 1993. Interested readers may go through it. After 4 years same queries are raised by Mr. Shourie. This is nothing but a deeply seated conspiracy, to deprive Dr. Ambedkar the credit he is given, as a constitution maker. This is a typical brahmnical plot. This doubt never rose in the minds of contemporaries of Dr. Ambedkar. Those who worked with him, those who have seen him working on the constitution, never raised the doubt about his role as a principle architect of our constitution, rather they all praised him open heartedly, for his extra ordinary work, for his sincerety and for his knowledge, for his mastery over the subject and his sense of Nationality. And now these dwarfs who can not even judge his intellectual level are disperately attempting to challenge him.

When a person or a student does not understand a particular thing by conventional teaching, he is explained by giving an example, or by giving simile. Inspite of reading the Constitutional Assembly Debates Shourie could not understand it properly. Hence it is proper to explain by giving some examples or simile.

- * This is a dialogue between mother and her child.
- Child - "Mother, how was I born?"
- Mother - "Through heaven my son." Child being small does not question it, nor understand it properly. After few years, he starts going to school., chats with his friends and senior colleagues, Again he asks

- Child - "Mother how was I born ?"
- Mother - "Through the womb, my son. "Child doesnot understand this too, but this time he doesnot believe his mother. Inspite of the fact that she is the mother of the child what proof she can give to the child. Maximally she can ask the witnesses present at that time to convince the child. If the child does not believe it ? Then what : Then one can assume that something is wrong with the child.

Same is the case with Mr. Shourie. What sort of proof he wants is difficult to understand. The witnesses available at that time were the people who were in the constituent assembly and they have very clearly and emphatically accepted Dr. Ambedkar as the principle architect of the constitution and this is evident from their speeches. If Shourie does not agree with these witnesses too, then definitely something is wrong with him.

I would like to give another example, as to why Dr. Ambedkar is called the principle architect of the Indian constitution. When there is war between two countries, soldiers, officers, colonel, Major, Caption, brigadier, pilot, a micro wave operator all contribute in the war. But finally when the war is over, credit or the discredit goes to the chief of Army. Not because he has done everything single handed, but because he has planned for the war and implemented it efficiently. No doubt efforts of every soldier have contributed to give the victory, but credit goes to Chief of Army for his crucial role. Similarly even though everything needed for constitution making was not done by Dr. Ambedkar nor it was humanly possible, nor it was expected from him. But the most dynamic pivotal & crucial role played by him was most important and all other rolls were moving round him & hence he is the Principle architect of our constitution.

Shourie has very rudimentary ideas about the word

"Author". He thinks that writing a novel, sitting in the house and drafting of a constitution should follow the same sojourn. Is it nor funny and childish. Lest he would not have written on page no. 587, in a chapter titled 'The Myth Fostered, driven in' "consider a self evident point. In the proceedings of the assembly, Ambedkar is moving one amendment after another. If he is the one who had written the constitution, if he is the one who was deciding what it ought to be how come he is moving all these amendments to what he had himself written".

Alas ! What a poor guy. What a poor idea about drafting of constitution. A foreign scholar would laugh at such a statement. It was a Constitution of India to be drafted, not a novel to be written in the house. Articles were to be discussed in all angles, amendments made if any and after consensus the article was accepted in the constitution. Dr. Ambedkar was not a dictator. Nor was he a God. But this is what writer wants or intends. Orthodox Hindus, by way of Vedas, Puranas, Manusmruti are mentally tuned to accept those things only which are heavenly, told by God, which establish absolute authority wherein a comma or a word cannot be changed, where the verdict is unchallengable. Had our constitution be like this Shourie would have gladly accepted it. But to the misfortune of Shourie and his cult, Dr. Ambedkar was a democrat in thought and behaviour, And most important, he was an untouchable Mahar. How can Shourie tolerate this.

At many places writer has lost his control over the situation and he himself does not know what he is criticising and what for. There is jealousy and hatred lurking in all his attempts to denounce Dr. Ambedkar. It is no fun to dissect all his statements. I would attempt only few to show the meaningless criticism done by Shourie. Unbious, objective opinion of research scholars Dr. K. Gopal et. al. in their

research document is an answer itself to all doubts? of Shourie.

"Ambedkar was eminently qualified to occupy the position of Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly of India by virtue of his academic distinction as a constitutional expert, his intimate knowledge of the working of the Govt. of India act. 1935 and his rich experience in the political development of India. In several ways, Ambedkar participated in the crucial constitutional developments since 1927, as a delegate to the Round Table Conferences, as a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, as the first Law Minister of Independent India under the Prime Ministership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

The proceedings and deliberations of the Constituent Assembly shows Ambedkar's constructive role in framing, piloting and defending the provisions of the Draft constitution against many criticism. At the same time, his manner, & Methodology were forceful and logical in clarifying issues as well as resolving many controversies. Ambedkar has left his mark on the Constitution of India. Rightly, Ambedkar deserves the title to be called as the Chief architect of India's Constitution.

The contribution of Ambedkar as the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to the shaping of the Indian federalism as an instrument of national integration has been substantial. It also reveals his role and remarkable qualities as a statesman, democrat, nationalist, federalist and above all as a patriot committed to the well-being of India and her people.

*Ambedkar's contribution to the theory and practice of the Indian Federalism is worth remembering at a time when the nation is at cross-roads and when the integrity of India is challenged by certain divisive forces and secessionist movements in different parts of India."*⁷¹

71. Dr. Krishan Gopal, Dr. J. Lal & S.S. Sharma : 'Thought & Ideas of Gandhi, Nehru, Tagore & Ambedkar' P. 209-216.

A brief outline of the constituent assembly and formation of Constitution is given below. It would clear many things for the reader.

After the end of second war in 1945 the question of Indian Freedom assumed priority. The British Govt. sent three men delegation to India to suggest the ways and means for the smooth transfer of power. This delegation called 'Cabinet Mission' announced on 16th March 1946 its proposal in which it was suggested that a constituent Assembly be set up to frame a Constitution for future governance of India.

Accordingly elections to the Constituent Assembly were held in which members were elected by the Provincial Legislature Assembly. Dr. Ambedkar managed to enter the Constituent Assembly through the Bengal Assembly. The constituent assembly started its work of framing free India's Constitution on 9th Dec. 1946. The first meeting of the Constituent Assembly of India commenced in the Constitutional hall, New Delhi on Monday the 9th Dec. 1946 at 11 O'clock. The assembly passed the rule for the election of Chairman of the Constituent Assembly on 10th Dec. 1946. The assembly thereafter elected Dr. Rajendra Prasad as Permanent Chairman of the assembly on 11th Dec. 1946.⁷²

The cabinet Mission had recommended the setting up of an advisory committee. Accordingly the assembly constituted the advisory committee under the Chairmanship of Sardar Patel. The committee constituted 50 members, in which Dr. Ambedkar was one. To facilitate its work the advisory committee appointed the following four sub committees.

1. Fundamental Rights Sub Committee
2. Minorities Sub committee
3. North East Frontier Tribal Area Sub committee

72. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. XIII, P. 5.

4. Excluded and partially excluded areas (other than those in Assam) Sub committee

Dr. Ambedkar was a member of the first two sub committees, and took keen interest in their deliberations. The constituent assembly also appointed three other committees namely

- a) Union Power committee.
- b) The union constitution committee
- c) Provincial constitution committee.

Dr. Ambedkar was member of Union constitution committee.

Comittee to scrutinise Draft constitution :

- 1. Shri. Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar
- 2. Shri. N. Gopalaswami Ayyar
- 3. The Hon'ble Dr. B.R. Ambedkar
- 4. Shri. K.M. Munshi
- 5. Saiyid Mohd. Saadulla
- 6. Sir B.L. Mittar
- 7. Shri. D.P. Khaitan

They were appointed to scrutinise and suggest the necessary amendments to the Draft constuttion of India, prepared in the office of the Assembly on the basis of the decision taken in Assembly.⁷³

The Constituent Assembly met on 4th Nov. 1948. In the afternoon session the President called upon Dr. Ambedkar to move his motion. Accordingly Dr. Ambedkar introduced the Draft constitution to the Assembly for consideration. After the draft constitution was presented a brief general discussion

73. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. XIII, P. 29.

followed which is called the first reading of the constitution.⁷⁴ The second reading commenced on 15th Nov. 1948. In second reading the constitution was discussed clause by clause in detail. The discussions concluded on 17th Oct. 1949. The constituent assembly again met on 14th Nov. 1949 for the third reading. This was completed on 26th Nov. 1949, when the constitution was declared passed & there after the President of the Assembly signed it. All these things are narrated to a reader to acquaint him with the sojourn of the constitution.

An example of child cited above tells that in many situations, proof of any kind cannot be given, nor it is essential. Circumstantial evidences in the form of speeches given by various participants of the constituent assembly are the concrete proof of his (Dr. Ambedkar's) role in constitution making.

T.T. Krishnamachari (Member, constituent Assembly)

*"..... The house is perhaps aware that, of the seven members of Drafting committee. nominated by you, one had resigned from the house and was replaced. One was in America and his place was not filled up. And another person was engaged in state affairs and there was a void to that extent. One or two people were away from Delhi & perhaps reasons of health did not permit them to attend. So it happened ultimately that the burden of drafting the constitution fell upon Dr. Ambedkar & I have no doubt that we are grateful to him for having achieved this task in a manner which is undoubtedly commendable....."*⁷⁵

Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya :

"..... When all is said & done, we must realise how much we owe, to half dozen men that have fashioned this constitution

74, 75. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: 'Writing and Speeches', Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. XIII, P. 47 & Forewords.

and given it a shape and form. Our friend Dr. Ambedkar has gone away else I should have liked to tell him what a steam roller intellect he brought to bear upon this magnificent and tremendous task. : irresistible, indomitable unconquerable levelling down tall palms, and short poppies whatever he felt to be right he stood by regardless of consequences....."⁷⁶

Then he praised Alladi, Goapalaswami, K.M. Munshi, Mr. Madhav Rao, Saadulla, T.T. Krishnamachari. But this can be simulated to a job of "Vote of thank". A person who is giving vote of thanks, thanks to the chief guest, guest of honour, speakers and then he thanks the audience, electrician, door keeper and loud speaker technician. This does not mean that work of chief guest and loud speaker technician is at par.

Shri. Mahavir Tyagi :

".....Sir I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity. Sir, I assure you 4 or 5 minutes granted by you are the most precious of my life, past, present and future, and they are the most thrilling moments, I stand today face to face with the picture of my old, old dreams and fruits of my straneous labours of thirty years. A concrete pitcture is before us. Dr. Ambedkar who was the main artist has laid aside his brush and unveiled the pitcture for the public to see and comment upon....."⁷⁷

Even reader can go through the exhaustive and deeply studied disourse given by Dr. Ambedkar on 4th Nov. 1948. It is beyound the scope of this book to give details. However few excerpts of the members of the constituent Assembly given after speech of Dr. Ambedkar are worth noting.

76, 77. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: '*Writing and Speeches*', Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. XIII, P. 1202 & 1205.

Pandit Lakshmikanta Maitra : (W. Bengal : Gen)

"..... Sir, I would be failing in my duty if I do not at the very outset congratulate my Honourable friend and old colleague Dr. Ambedkar, for the magnificent performance he made yesterday, The House appreciates the stupendous amount of time and energy he has spent in giving the constitutional proposals a definite shape"

Shri. Arun ChandraGuha (W. Bengal : Gen.)

".....As for the fundamental rights Dr. Ambedkar he is a learned professor and I acknowledge his learning & his ability and I think the draft constitution is mainly his handicraft in his introductory speech, he has entered into a sort of metaphysical debate. He has introduced a new term....."

All the witnesses have accepted the vital role played by Dr. Ambedkar. All these people were not only witnesses but the actual participants in the Constituent Assembly. If we cannot believe statements of these people who else can we believe Mr. Shourie ?

On this background, Let us read speech of Dr. Ambedkar given in constituent Assembly. His speech tells about his intellectual capacity, his concern for the nation, his concern for the depressed classes, his complete grip over the subject and detailed knowledge of this country.

Dr. Ambedkar : "Sir looking back on the work of the constituent assembly, it would now be 2 Years, 11 Months & 17 days since it met first on 9th Dec. 1946. During this period the constituent Assembly has altogether held 11 sessions. Out of these 11 sessions the first 6 were spent in passing the objective resolutions and the considerations of the reports of committees on provincial constitution, on minorities, and on scheduled areas and scheduled Tribes. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11th sessions were devoted to the consideration of the Draft constitution. (Dr. Ambedkar was a member to most of these sub committees. And reports of these sub committees

were taken into account while formulating the rough draft) -Not the draft of Mr. B.N. Rau-. These 11 sessions of constituent Assembly have consumed 165 days. Out of these the Assembly spent 114 days for consideration of Draft constitution.

Coming to the Drafting committee, it was elected by Constituent Assembly on 29th August 1947. It held its first meeting on 30 Aug. since 30 Aug. it sat for 141 days during which it was engaged in the preparation of the Draft constitution. The draft constitution as prepared by the constitutional Advisor, as a text for the drafting committee (On reports of sub committee) to work upon, consisted of 243 articles and 13 schedules. The first draft constitution as prepared by the drafting committee to the Constituent Assembly contained 315 articles and 8 schedules. At the end of consideration stage the number of amendments to the draft constitution tabled were approximately 7,635. Of them, the total number of amendments actually moved in the house were 2473.

"Turning to the quality of the work done by the Drafting Committee, Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad felt it his duty to condemn it out right. In his opinion, the work done by the Drafting Committee is not only not worthy of commendation, but is positively below par. Every body has a right to have his opinion about the work done by the Drafting Committee and Mr. Naziruddin is Welcome to have his own." (What a democratic approach and mind)

"As to the compliments that have been showered upon me both by the members of the Assembly as well as by my colleagues of the Drafting committee I feel so much overwhelmed that I cannot find adequate words to express fully my gratitude to them. I came to the Constituent Assembly with no grater aspiration than to safeguard the interests of Scheduled caste. I had not the remotest idea that I would be called upon to undertake more responsible function. I was therefore a greatly suprised when the assembly elected me to the Drafting committee. I was more than surprised when the Drafting committee elected me to be its Chairman. There were in the Drafting Committee men bigger, better and

more competent than myself such as my friend Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar. I am grateful to the Constituent Assembly & the Drafting Committee for reposing in me so much trust & confidence and have chosen me as their instrument and given me this opportunity of serving the country. (Cheers) -He never hid anything & spoke nothing but truth-. He did not spend his time on experiments on truth.

"The credit that is given to me does not really belong to me. It belongs partly to Sir, B.N. Rau, the constitutional advisor to the constituent assembly who prepared the rough draft of the constitution for the consideration of the drafting committee. (Shourie has wasted his energy in proving this, which is easily stated by Dr. Ambedkar) A part of the credit must go to the members of the Drafting Committee who as I have said have sat for 141 days and without whose ingenuity to device new formulae and capacity to tolerate and accomodate different points of view, the task of framing the constitution could not have come to so successful a conclusion. Much greater share of the credit must go to Mr. S.N. Mukharjee the chief draftsman of the constitution.

"The proceedings of this constituent Assembly would have been very dull if all the members had yielded to the rule of party discipline. Party discipline, in all its rigidity would have converted this Assembly into a gathering of "Y" men. Fortunately there were rebels. They were Mr. Kamath, Dr. P.S. Deshmukh, Mr. Sidhva, Prof. Saxena and Pandit Thakurdas Bhargava. Along with them I must mention Prof. K.T. Shah and Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzaru. The points they raised were mostly ideological. That I was not prepared to accept their suggestions does not diminish the value of their suggestion, nor lessen the service they have rendered to the assembly in enlivening its proceedings. I am grateful to them. -Underlined sentence clearly indicates his authoritative role-. In his further discourse he has cleared that it is not the constitution, but the users of the constitution who would make it good or bad.

In response to criticism by communists and socialists he says "The condemnation of the constitution largely came from two quarters, the Communist Party and the Socialist Party. Why do they condemn the constitution ? Is it because it is really a bad constitution ? I venture to say "No". The communist party wants a constitution based upon the principle of the Dictatorship. of the Proletariat. They condemn the constitution because it is based on the Parliamentary democracy. The socialists want two things. The first thing they want is that if they come in power, the constitution must give them freedom to nationalise or socialise all private property without payment of compensation. The second thing that the socialist want is that the Fundamental rights mentioned in the constitution must be absolute and without any limitation so that if their party fails to come into power, they would have the unfettered freedom not merely to criticise, but also to overthrow the state. These are the main grounds on which the constitution is being condemned. I do not say that the principle of parliamentary democracy is the only ideal form of political democracy. I do not say that the principle of no acquisition of private property without compensation is so sacrosanct that there can be no departure from it. I do not say that the fundamental rights can never be absolute and the limitations set upon them can never be lifted. What I do say is that the principles embodied in the constitution are the views of the present generation. If you think this to be over statement, I say they are the views of the members of Constituent Assembly. Why blame the Drafting committee for embodying them in the constitution ? I say why blame even the members of Constituent Assembly ? Jefferson the great American Statesman who played so great a part in the making of the American Constitution, has expressed some very weighty views which makers of Constitution can never afford to ignore. In one place he has said 'We may consider each generation as a distinct nation, with a right, by the will of majority, to bind themselves, but none to bind the succeeding generation, more than the inhabitants of another country.'

- Shourie thinks that use of Jefferson's statement by Dr.

Ambedkar is the constitution maker. But at the other end he holds Dr. Ambedkar fully responsible. This is minmindedness. Statement of Jefferson is an eternal sentence. It is applicable to all the countries, at all times. It is not shrugging off the responsibility in any way. It is hard to believe that Shourie can't understand such a simple thing.

"Here I could have ended. But my mind is so full of the future of our country that I feel I ought to take this occasion to give expression to some of my reflections thereon. On 26th january 1950, India will be an Independant country. (Cheers) What would happen to her independance? Will she maintain her independance or will she lose it again ? This is the first thought that comes to my mind. It is not that India was never an Independant country. The point is that she once lost the independance she had. Will she lose it a second time ? It is this thought which makes me most anxious for the future. What purturbes me greatly is the fact that not only India has once before lost her independance, but she lost it by the infidelity and treachery of some her own people. In the invasion of Sindh by Mahommad-Bin-Kasim the military commanders of King Dahar accepted bribes from the agents of Mohammad-Bin-Kasim and refused to fight on the side of their king. It was Jaichand who invited Mohd. Ghorī to invade India and fight against prithvi Raj and promised him the help of himself and the Solanki kings. When Shivaji was fighting for liberation of Hindus the other Maratha Noble men and Rajpur Kings were fighting the battle on the side of Mougāl Emperor. When British were trying to destroy the Sikh rulers Gulab singh, their principle commander sat silent and did not help to save the sikh kingdom. In 1857 when a large part of India had declared a war of independance against British the Sikh stood and watched the event as silent spectators.

"Will history repeat it self ? It is this thought which fills me with anxiety. This anxiety is deepened by the realisation of the fact that in addition to our old enemies in the form of castes

and creeds we are going to have many political parties with diverse and opposing political creeds. Will Indians place the country above their creed or will they place creed above country ? I do not know. But this much is certain that if the parties place creed above the country our independence will be put in jeopardy a second time and probably lost for ever. This eventuality we must all resolutely guard against. We must be determined to defend our independence with the last drop of our blood. (Cheers)

Then he expressed his concern over political democracy, as it was lost from India, in due course of time. In this connection he says "If we wish to maintain the democracy not merely in form but also in fact what must we do ? The first thing in my judgement we must do is to hold fast to Constitutional methods of achieving our social & economical objectives. It means we must abandon the bloody methods of Civil Disobedience, non co-operation and Satyagraha. When there was no way left for constitutional methods for achieving economical and social objectives there was a great deal of justification for unconstitutional methods. But where constitutional methods are open, there can be no justification for these unconstitutional methods. These methods are nothing but Grammar of Anarchy and sooner they are abandoned the better for us. (Is it not true even today ? Morcha, Band Strikes have turmoiled our politico social life.)

"The second thing we must do is to observe the caution which John Stuart Mill has given to all who are interested in the maintenance of democracy, namely "Not to lay their liberties at the feet of a great man or to trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their Institution." There is nothing wrong in being grateful to greatmen who have rendered life long services to the country. But there are limits to gratefulness. As has been well said by the Irish patriot Daniel O'Connell 'No man can be grateful at the cost of his honour, no woman can be grateful at the cost of her chastity and no nation can be grateful at the cost of its liberty'. This caution is far more necessary in the case of India than in the case of any other country, for

in India, Bhakti or what may be called the path of devotion or hero worship plays a part in its politics, unequalled in magnitude by the part it plays in politics of any other country in the world. Bhakti in religion may be a road to the salvation of the soul. But in politics, Bhakti or Hero worship is a sure road to degradation and to eventual dictatorship". -Had these words been uttered by any other person in India, author would have danced with a certification that he is a real statesman, with vision.-

"The third thing we must do is not be content with mere political democracy. We must make our political democracy a social democracy as well. Political democracy can't last unless there lies at the base of it a social democracy. What does a social democracy mean ? It means a way of life which recognises liberty, equality and fraternity as the principles of life. These principles of liberty, equality and fraternity are not to be treated as separate items in a trinity. They form a union of trinity in the sense that to divorce one from the other is to defeat the very purpose of democracy. Liberty cannot be divorced from equality, equality cannot be divorced from liberty, Nor can liberty & equality be divorced from fraternity. Without equality liberty would produce the supremacy of the few over many (What exists today in India). Equality without liberty would kill individual initiative. Without fraternity liberty & equality can't be a natural course of things. It would require a constable to enforce them. We must begin by acknowledging the fact that there is complete absence of two things in Indian society. One of these is equality. On the social plane we have in India a society based on the principle of graded inequality which mean elevation for some and degradation for others. On the economic plane we have a society in which there are some who have immense wealth as against many who live in abject poverty. On 26th January 1950 we are going to enter into a life of contradiction. In politics we will have equality and in social & economic life we will have inequality. In politics we will be recognising the principle of one man one vote and one value. In our social & economic life, we shall by reason of our social

& economic structure continue to deny the principle of one man one value. How long shall we continue to deny equality in our social and economic life?

"If we continue to deny it for long, we will do so only by putting our political democracy in peril. We must remove this contradiction at the earliest possible moment or else those who suffer from inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy which this assembly has so labouriously build up.

"..... These are reflections about the tasks lie ahead of us. They may not be very pleasant to some. But there can be no gainsaying that political power in this country has too long been the monopoly of a few and the many are not only beasts of burden, but also beasts of pray. This monopoly has merely deprived them of their chance of betterment, it has sapped them of what may be called the significance of life. These down trodden classes are tired of being governed.....

"Independance is no doubt a matter of joy. But let us not forget that this independance has thrown on us great responsibilities. By independance we have lost the excuse of blaming the British for anything going wrong. If hereafter things go wrong, we will have nobody to blame except ourselves. There is great danger of things going wrong. Times are fast changing people including our own are being moved by new ideologies. They are getting tired of Govt. by the people. They are prepared to have Govt. for the people and are indifferent whether it is a Govt. of the people by the people. If we wish to preserve the constitution in which we have sought to enshrine the principle of Govt. of the People, for the people and by the people, let us resolve not to be trady in the recognition of the evils that lie across our path and which induce people to prefer Govt. for people to Govt. by the people nor to be weak in our initiation to remove them. This is the only way to serve the country. I know of no better."⁷⁸

78. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *Writing and Speeches*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. XIII, P. 1206-1218.

Any doubt about his concern for the nation, any doubt about his concern for the society, concern for the depressed classes. Any doubt about his intellectual capacity, his tremendous knowledge in various fields, his perfect grip over the constitutional matters ? Still dwarfs like Shourie try to increase height of some shrubs. Dr. Ambedkar has put forward very clearly the challenges and dangers lying in front of the country. No other so called 'National leader' has done it, not I think anyone of them was capable of.

As far as Sir B.N. Rau is concerned, Dr. Rajendra Prasad has distinctly stated his role in his speech. Dr. Rajendra Prasad in his final and concluding address. "*The method which the constituent assembly adopted in connection with the constitution was first to lay its term of reference as it were in the form of an objective Resolution which was moved by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in an inspiring speech & which constitutes now the Preamble of our constitution. It then proceeded to appoint a number of committees to deal with different aspects of constitutional problems. Dr. Ambedkar mentioned the names of these committees. Several of these had as their chairman either Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or Sardar Patel to whom thus goes the credit for the fundamentals of our constitution. I have only to add that they worked in a business like manner and produced reports which were considered by the assembly and their (Sub committees) recommendations were adopted as the basis on which the Draft of the Constitution had to be prepared. This was done by Mr. B.N. Rau.* (Clearly indicates Rau was not author) who brought to bear on his task a detailed knowledge of constitutions of other countries & an extensive knowledge of the conditions of this country as well as his own administrative experience. The assembly then appointed the Drafting committee which worked on the original draft prepared by Mr. B.N. Rau and produced the

draft constitution which was considered by the assembly at great length at the second reading stage."⁷⁹

So it is very clear that Mr. B.N. Rau was only a constitutional expert, whose job was to prepare a rough draft on the basis of recommendations of various sub committees. This rough draft underwent its first reading which was not very significant. During its second reading various amendments were put forward. Discussions were held and decisions were taken by consensus. So even though Dr. Ambedkar is not the 'Author' of constitution as per definition of Shourie, even though the original script underwent lot of metamorphosis during discussions, even though Dr. Ambedkar left the decision to the house at times, still, he is the Principle architect of the constitution of India. Here lies the simile.

Child : "Dad ! who prepared these Laddus ?"

Father : "Your mother my son."

Child : "Father ! How did she prepare them ?"

Father : "She bought Chana - dal from market, grinded it to powder then..."

Child (interrupting) : How chana is prepared ?"

Father : "My son, farmer sows the Gram seeds. God pours rains, then Sun light gives Nutrition to the plant, wind gives vitality to the plant. Gram seeds are dried & then powdered by miller."

Child : (confused) This means farmer has prepared the laddus. No No !

God has prepared the laddus. How this is possible? Sun light has prepared the laddus. And he is totally confused.

I am sure Mr. Shourie is in no better position. Even though farmer, shop keeper, Sun light, Rains every one has

79. Arun Shourie : 'Worshipping False God' P-590

contributed in the preparation of laddus in remote possible sense, it was really the mother of the child who prepared the laddus. Similarly there may be lot many who may have helped in the contribution of constitution. But the Lion's share was that of Dr. Ambedkar & hence everyone in the constituent assembly accepted him as the chief architect of the constitution. There can be no doubt about this and one should not even try to creat a doubt about this.

Mr. B..N. Rau was a constitutional expert to the constituent Assembly. Period of his work is from 7-12-46 to 29-8-47. After this Mr. Rau is never on the screen. During discussions, during amendments, during debates he never comes into picture.

Writer has devoted the pages 389 to 393 discussing the issue of discreatory power of Governor, and has created a halo that Dr. Ambedkar did nothing in this article. He relied on the assembly and there was a major metamorphosis in that article. Really speaking it is not so. Dr. Ambedkar had put his views very clearly in front of the assembly and did explain his stand on the issue with his usual matery over the subject & I do not think that there was a major metamorphosis in the original article No. 143. Arun Shourie is totally confused and delirious on the issue of article 143. He has failed to understand the issue, he has failed to understand the role of Dr. Ambedkar, & I believe it is beyond the intellectual compitance of Shourie. For the ease of readers, I would give the glimpses of the role of Dr. Ambedkar.

The Hon'ble Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : Mr. president, Sir, I did not think that it would have been necessary for me to speak and take part in this debate after what my friend, Mr. T.T. Krishnamachari, had said on this amendment, of Mr. Kamath., but my friend Mr. Kunzru pointedly asked me the question and demanded a reply. I thought that out of courtsey I should say a few words. Sir, the main and the crucial question is, should the Governor have discretionary powers ? It is this question which

is the main and the principle question. After we come to some decision on this question the other question the words used in the last part of the clause (1) of article 143 should be retained in that article or should be transferred somewhere else could be carefully considered. The first thing therefore, that I propose to do is to devote myself to this question which, as I have said is the crucial question. It has been said in the course of debate that the retention of discretionary power in the Governor is contrary to responsible Government in the provinces. It has also been said that retention of discretionary power in the Governor smells of the Govt. of India Act, 1935, which in the main was undemocratic. Now speaking for myself, I have no doubt in my mind that the retention in on the vesting the Governor with certain discretionary power is in no sense contrary to or in no sense a negation of responsible Govt. I do not wish to take up the point because on this point I can very well satisfy the house by reference to the provisions in the constitution of Canada and constitution of Australia. I do not think anybody in this house would dispute that the Canadian system of Government is not a fully responsible system of Govt. nor will anybody in this house challenge that the Australian Govt. is not a responsible form of Govt. Having said that, I would like to read section 55 as the Canadian constitution.....

Pandit Hridaynath Kunzru : "May I ask Dr. Ambedkar when the British North America Act was passed ?"

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : "This does not matter at all."

Shri H.V. Kamath : "Nearly a century ago."

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : "This is my reply. The Canadians and Australians have not found it necessary to delete this provision even at this stage. They are quite satisfied that the retention of this provision in section 55 of the Canadian act is fully compatible with responsible Govt. If they had felt that this provision is not compatible with responsible Govt. they have even today, as Dominions, the fullest right to abrogate this provision. They have not done

so. Therefore in reply to Pandit Kunzru, I can ~~very~~ well say that the Canadian and the Australian do not think that such a provision is an infringement of responsible Govt.

Shri. Loknath Mishra : (Orissa : General) "On the point of order, Sir, are we going to have the status of Canada or Australia ? or are we going to have a Republican constitution?"

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : " I could not follow what he said; If as I hope, the house is satisfied that the existence of the provision vesting a certain amount of discretion in the Governor is not incompatible with responsible Govt. there can be no dispute that the retention of this clause is desirable and in my judgement necessary. The only question that arises is....."

Pandit Hridaynath the Kunzru : "Well, Dr. Ambedkar has missed the point of criticism altogether. The criticism is not that in article 175 some powers might not be given to the Governor, the criticism is against vesting the Governor with certain discretionary powers of a general nature in the article under discussion."

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : " I think he has misread the article. I am sorry I do not have the draft constitution with me. "Except in so far as he is by or under this constitution" those are the words. If the words were "Except whenever he thinks that he should exercise this power of discretion against the wishes or against the advice of the Ministers" then I think the criticism made by my friend Pt. Kunzru would have been valid. The clause is a very limited clause : it says "Except in so far as he is by or under this constitution" therefore, article 143 will have to be read in conjunction with such other articles which specifically reserve the power to the Governor. It is not a general clause giving the Governor power to disregard the advice of his ministers in any matter in which he finds he ought to disregard. There I think lies the fallacy of the argument of my honourable friend Pt. Kunzru.

Therefore, as I said having stated that there is nothing incompatible with the retention of the discretionary power in the governor in specified cases with the system of responsible Govt. The only question that arises is, how should we provide for the mention of this discretionary power ? It seems to me that there are three ways by which this could be done. One way is to omit the words from article 143 as my honourable friend, Pt. Kunzru and others desire and to add to such article as 175 or 188 or such other provision which the house may thereafter introduce, vesting the Governor with the discretionary power, saying notwithstanding article 143, the Governor shall have this or that power. The other way would be to say in article 143" that except as provided in articles so and so specifically mentioned articles 175, 188, 200 or whatever they are. "But the point I am trying to submit to the house is that the House cannot escape from mentioning in some manner that the Governor shall have discretion.

Now the matter which seems to find some kind of favour with my honourable friend, Pt. Kunzru and those who have spoken in the same way is that the words should be omitted from here and should be transferred somewhere else or that the specific articles should be mentioned in article 143. It seems to me that this is a mere a method of drafting. There is no question of substance and no question of principle. I personally myself would be quite willing to amend the last portion of clause (1) of article 143 if I knew at this stage what are the provisions that this constituent assembly proposes to make with regarding to the vesting of the Governor with discretionary power. My difficulty is that we have not as yet come either to article 175 or 188 nor have we exhausted all the possibilities of other provisions being made, vesting the Governor with discretionary power. If I knew that, I would very readily agree to amend article 143 and to mention the specific article, but that cannot be done now. Therefore my submission is that no wrong could be done, if the words as they stand in article 143 remain as they are. They are certainly not in consistent."

Shri. H.V. Kamath : "Is there is no material difference between article 61(1) relating to the President Vis-a-vis his minister & this article?"

B.R. Ambedkar : "Of course there is, because we do not want to vest the president with any discretionary power. Because the provincial Govt.s are required to work in subordination to the central Govt. and therefore, in order to see that they do act in subordination to the central Govt. the Governor will reserve certain things in order to give the president the opportunity to see that the rules under which the provincial Govts. are supposed to act according to the constitution or in subordination to the central Govt. are observed."

H.V. Kamath : "Will it not be better to specify certain articles in the constitution with regard to discretionary powers, instead of conferring general discretionary powers like this?"

B.R. Ambedkar : "I said so that I would be very radily do it. I am prepared to introduce specific articles, if I knew what are the articles which the house is going to incorporate in the constitution regarding vesting of the discretinary powers in the Governor."

H.V. Kamath : "Why not hold it over ?"

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : "We can revise. This house is perfectly competant to revise article 143, If after going through the whole of it, the house feels that the better way would be to mention the articles specifically, it can do so. It is purely a logomachy. (Two amendments were rejected. Article 143 was added to the constitution).⁸⁰

Mr. Shourie has made complete mess of the whole issue. He is confused and trying to confuse the readers too. Whatever balance on this side or that side he has uttered is his own creation. There is no ambiguity in any of Dr. Ambedkar's statement. If at all there is any ambiguity it is

80. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. XIII, P. 615-618.

in the mind of Mr. Shourie and it has percolated in his book.

Shourie has tried to make similar mess in article 31. He himself on page 393 has clearly pointed out that there was lot of discussion on this article of 'Right to property' which was changed whole sale by Pandit Nehru. When the subject was opened two years later, Dr. Ambedkar criticised article 31 saying he does not take any responsibility for it. I do not find what is the ambiguity here ? When the article has gone against the wish of Dr. Ambedkar merely because majority has voted for it, how can he defend that article? Shourie has cited those examples where lot of heat was created in the assembly. Readers are requested to go through following discussion. This will tell them the powerful / decisive role played by Dr. Ambedkar during assembly debates.

Clause 17 :

Sardar Patel : Sir, I move clause 17. "Conversion from one religion to another brought about by coercion or undue influence shall not be recognised by law"

K.M. Munshi : Sir, I beg to move the following amendment : "That for clause 17 substitute the following clause."

"Any conversion from one religion to another of any person brought about by fraud, coercion or undue influence or of a minor under the age of 18 shall not be recognised by law."

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : "Mr. President, Sir I am sorry to say that I do not find myself in agreement with the amendment which has been moved by Mr. Munshi relating to the question of the conversion of minor children. The clause, as it stands probably gives the impression to the House that this question relating to the conversion of minors was not considered by the Fundamental rights comittee or by the Minorities comittee or by advisory comittee.

I should like to assure the house that a good deal of consideration was bestowed on this question and every aspect was examined. It was after examining the whole question in all its aspects, and seeing the difficulties which came up, that the advisory committee came to the conclusion that they should adhere to the clause as it stands now.

Sir, the difficulty is so clear to my mind that I find no other course but to request Mr. Munshi to drop his amendment. With regard to children there are three possible cases which can be visualised. First of all there is a case of children with parents and guardians. There is the case of children who are orphans, who have no parents and no guardians in the legal sense of the word. Supposing you have this clause prohibiting the conversion of children below 18, what is going to be the position of children who are orphans. Are they not going to have any kind of religion? Are they not to have any religious instructions given to them by some one who happens to take a kindly interest in them? It seems to me that, if the clause as worded by Mr. Munshi was adopted, viz, that no child below the age of 18 shall be converted it would follow that children who are orphans, who have no legal guardian cannot have any kind of religious instructions. I am sure that this is not the result which this house would be happy to contemplate. Therefore, such a class of subjects shall have to be excepted from the operation of the amendment proposed by Mr. Munshi.

Then I come to the other class, viz, children with parents and guardians. They may fall into two categories. For the sake of clarity it might be desirable to consider their cases separately ; the first is this: where children are converted with the knowledge and consent of their guardians or parents. The second case is that of children of parents who have become converts.

It does seem to me that there ought to be a prohibition upon the conversion of minor children with legal guardians, where the conversion takes place without the consent and knowledge

of the legal guardians. That I think, is a very legitimate proposition. No missionary who wants to convert a child which is under the lawful guardianship of some person, who according to the law of guardianship is entitled to regulate and control the religious faith of that particular child, ought to deprive that person or guardian of the right of having notice and having knowledge that the child is being converted to another faith. That, I think is a simple proposition to which there can be no objection.

But when we come to the other case, viz, where parents are converted and we have to consider the case of their children, then I think we come across what I might say a very hard rock. If you are going to say that, although parents may be converted because they are majors and above the age of 18, minors below the age of 18, although they are their children, are not to be converted with the parents, the question that we have to consider is, what arrangement we are going to make with regard to the children. Suppose, a parent is converted to christianity. Suppose the child of such a parents dies. The parent having been brought up in the christian faith, gives the christian burial to the dead child, to be regarded as an offence in law ? Take another case. Suppose a parent who has become converted has a daughter. He marries that daughter according to the christian rites. What is to be the consequence of that marriage ? What is to be effect of that marriage ? Is that marriage legal or not legal ?

If you do not want that the children should be converted you have to make some other kind of law with regard to guardianship in order to prevent the parents from exercising their rights to influence and shape the religious life of their children. Sir, I would like to ask whether it would be possible for this house to accept that a child of five for instance ought to be separated from his parents merely because the parents have adopted christianity or some religion which was not originally theirs. I refer to these difficulties in order to show that it is those difficulties which faced

the Fundamental Rights Committee, the minorities committee and the advisory committee and which led them to reject this proposition. It was because we realised, that the acceptance of the proposition, namely that a person shall not be converted below the age of 18, would lead to many disruptions, to so many evil consequences, that we thought it would be better to drop the whole thing altogether. The mere fact that we have made no such reference in clause 17 of the fundamental rights does not in my judgement prevent the legislature when it becomes operative from making any law in order to regulate this matter. My submission, therefore is that, the reference back of this clause to a committee for further consideration is not going to produce any better results. I have no objection to the matter being further examined by persons who feel differently about it, but I do like to say that all the three committees have given their best attention to the subject. I have therefore come to the conclusion that having regard to all the circumstances of the case, the bestway would be to drop the clause altogether. I have no objection to a provision being made that children who have legal and lawful guardians should not be converted without the knowledge and notice of the parents. That, I think ought to suffice in the case."⁸¹

Is there any doubt about the crucial role of Dr. Ambedkar in Constituent Assembly debates ? He always gave his opinions very clearly. There was never any ambiguity or uncertainty in his statements. His statements were always highly studied. His opinions were very much valued by the assembly members. And then finally accepted & drafted. It is this vital role, which automatically bestows him the title of constitution maker.

There were many situations during the amendments which created lot of heat, but all these discussions tell only one thing and that is the role of Dr. Ambedkar was very

81. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. XIII, P. 17-19.

vital, crucial and many of the times final. Let us go through the discussions regarding amendments in the clause (1) of article 1.

Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur : If Dr. Ambedkar says that the word "Union" was not used with any great significance, there is no reason why we should not use the correct word "Federation", but if on the other hand the word "Union" was used with a purpose to that in course of time this federal form of Govt. may be converted into a unitary form of government, then it is for this House now to use the correct word so that it may be difficult in future for any power seeking party that may come into power easily to convert this into a unitary form of Govt. So, it is for the House to use the correct word "Federation" instead of the word "Union". This is my justification Sir, for moving this amendment. If you mean that the Govt. must be federal Govt. and not a unitary Govt. and if any want to prevent in future any power seeking party to convert it into a unitary form of Govt. and become fascist and totalitarian, then it is up to us now to use the correct word "Federation" may be substituted for the word union.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : I do not accept the amendment.

The amendment was negatived.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

H.V. Kamath : Sir, I beg to move : "That in clause (1) of article 1,

for the word 'states' the word 'Provinces' be substituted.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : Sir, I do not accept the amendment.

(At this stage Shri. Himmat Singh K. Maheshwari rose to speak)

Mr. Vice President : The Honourable Dr. Ambedkar has

already replied to the debate and I am sorry I cannot allow any further debate on the motion.

Pt. Hirdaynath Kunzru : Sir, if after every motion is moved by a member and you ask Dr. Ambedkar whether he agrees to it and after allowing him to express his views you debar other members from speaking on the subject, it will be very hard on the house.

Vice President : I am afraid Pt. Hirdaynath Kunzru has not realised exactly my position. I am always prepared to give every possible facility to every member here., which I need not demonstrate further than my reference to what I have done in the past few days. But just now we are pressed for time.....

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : Sir, I beg to move⁸²

"That at the end of clause (1) of article 1, the following be inserted and shall be known as the "United states of India".

Sir, this is a non controversial amendment the another amendment is alternative to this. I move "That at the end of clause (1) of article 1, the following be inserted and shall be known as "Union of India."

My other amendment is this. I move

"That at the end of clause (1) of Article 1, the following be inserted and shall be known as the Indian Union."

Sir, I submit these are three alternatives. I would prefer the first but it all depends on the House as to what it thinks about them."

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : Sir, I oppose all these amendments. With regard to the first amendment that India should be known

82. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. XIII, P. 330-333.

as the United States of India the argument set out by my friend Mr. Kamath is a perfectly valid argument and I accept it whole heartedly. I have given my own views as to why I used the word "Union" and did not use the word 'Federation'. With regard to the second amendment that India should be known as the Union of India, I also say that this is unnecessary, because we have all along meant that this country would be known as India, without giving any indications as to what are the relations of the component parts of the Indian Union in the very title of the name of the country. India has been known as India throughout history and throughout all these past years. As a member of the U.N.O. the name of the country is India and all agreements are signed as such and personally I think that the name of the country should not be in any sense give any indication as to what are the subordinate divisions, it is composed of. I therefore oppose the amendment, and maintain that the draft as it is presented to the house is the best so far as these amendments are concerned.

Vice President : I shall now put the amendments one by one to the vote.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahamad : Sir, I beg to leave to withdraw the amendments. The amendments were, by leave of the assembly, withdrawn.



Vice President : Amendment No. 113

Mr. Naziruddin Ahamd : I am not moving 113. But I am moving 114, Sir I beg to move : "That in the clause (2) of article 1, the word 'The' occuring at the begining be deleted.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : Sir, I raise point of order. My point of order is that this is not an amendment. Unless it changes the substance of the original proposition, it is not an amendment. I am trying to find out the reference in May's parliamentary practice. But I would like to raise this point at this moment. If my friend will forgive me. I think he is in habit of moving all sorts of

amendments asking for a comma here, no comma there and so on and I think we must put a stop to this sort of thing in the very beginning.

Naziruddin Ahmad : On the very threshold of independence, if I am to be stopped like this, I shall bow down and submit the decision of the chair.

Vice President : What is your reply to the point of order?

Naziruddin Ahmad : My reply to the point of order raised is this. I want to remove the word "The" from the article and therefore it is an amendment. It is certainly a drafting amendment. It may be opposed on the ground that it is insignificant, illogical or purposeless or useless and so forth. But Dr. Ambedkar is not right in asserting that it is not an amendment at all. It cannot be ruled out on the technical ground that it is not an amendment. And with regard to my Honourable friend's remark as to my habit of moving amendments like punctuations and other changes, I am happy to inform him and house that I have ceased to follow that habit so far as this amendment is concerned.

Vice President : You say it is a drafting amendment. Can't we leave it to the Drafting committee and its chairman for seeing to it at the third reading. I am sure they will accept these amendments if there is any substance in them.

Naziruddin Ahmad : In that case, it would be leaving the matter to the Drafting committee, instead of leaving it to the judgement of the house. The spokesman of the drafting committee has already given out his mind. Therefore if I were to agree to leave it to the drafting committee, it would be as good as withdrawing it. Therefore I have to submit, again, that the word "The" is not part of the name.

Vice President : I am waiting to hear Dr. Ambedkar on this point.

Dr. Ambedkar : Sir, I do not know why the Honourable member objects to the word "The". The is a definite article, and it is

quite necessary, because we are referring to the states in schedule. We are not referring to states in general, but to certain specific states which are mentioned in the schedule. Therefore the definite article 'The' is necessary. It refers to the definite states included in the schedule. Secondly I would like to submit this, that it would be wrong - and I speak about myself - for any Indian to presume such precise command over the English Language as to insist in a dogmatic manner that a comma is necessary here, a semi-colon is necessary there, or an article 'a' is proper here and article 'the' would be proper there and so on. But if my friend chooses to arrogate to himself the authority of a perfect grammarian so far as English is concerned, I would like to draw his attention to the Australian constitution from which we have borrowed these words and the definite article 'the' is used there. So I take shelter or refuge under the Australian constitution which, I suppose, we may take it, was drafted by men who were good draftmen and who knew the English Language and whom we can't hold guilty of having committed an error in the language."

Vice president : I put the amendment to vote.

THE AMENDMENT WAS NEGATIVED

Any doubt ! Even the punctuation and articles were the same which Dr. Ambedkar intended. I do not think that there is even a trace of doubt in the minds of readers, Now about the authority of Dr. Ambedkar as a constitution maker. In spite of all the childish questions raised by Shourie like which Ambedkar is author, Why he moved resolution after resolution, why there was change in the articles after discussions, why he left few things to the decision of the assembly, and why he did not accept the responsibility in a rare article. Everything is crystal clear, and there is no shadow of doubt. Similar authoritative & crucial role is played by Dr. Ambedkar regarding article 61, article 131 & article 143.

If the reader is careful enough he would realise how

masterly and confidently he dealt with the articles. And in all these matters there is no trace of Mr. B.N. Rau. A number of such examples can be cited which can prove beyond doubt, the most crucial role of Dr. Ambedkar in constitution making.

In spite of the clear fact that Sir B.N. Rau was appointed as a constitutional expert and he was guided by the recommendations made by various sub committees and to the fact that Dr. Ambedkar was a member to many of these subcommittees, the job of B.N. Rau was to construct a rough draft based on the recommendations of these subcommittees. In spite of this, why Shourie is presenting Mr. Rau as a man of vital importance in constitution making is beyond understanding. At one place he has presented B.N. Rau and at the other end he has quoted Alan Campbell - Johnson, the press attache to Lord Mountbatten.⁸³ If Alan is correct, out of 315 articles in New constitution 250 were taken from Govt. of India act 1935. If this is acceptable to Mr. Shourie, then even if it is agreed that all the rest 65 articles were introduced by Mr. B.N. Rau - which is next to impossible - the total contribution of Mr. Rau in the final Draft is not more than 1%. So the claim of Shourie to state that Rau's articles were accepted has very minimal or negligible or nil significant meaning.

Shourie has also referred to the statements of Dr. Ambedkar which infer that there is no need of constituent assembly. Shourie has criticised Dr. Ambedkar saying that he (Dr. Ambedkar) did not want constituent assembly and when it was formed, Ambedkar made every effort to enter in. All these opinions Shourie has formulated after reading "Communal dead lock and a way to solve it" but of course without understanding it. Lest he would not have raised such questions. Possibly it is beyond Mr. Shourie to understand

83. Alan Campbell-Johnson, Mission with Mountbatten, 1951, Hamish Hamilton, London, 85, P-319 quoted - Arun Shourie : 'Worshipping False Gods' P-578.

all those things. To clear the dust raised by Shourie, it is necessary to go through the chapter so as to have a clear idea what is break down clause and why Dr. Ambedkar opposed formation of constituent assembly. This extract is taken from Dr. Ambedkar's book "Communal deadlock and a way to solve it" Published by Govt. of Maharashtra in Vol.I.

"Before I set out in concrete terms the constitutional proposals I have in mind, I wish to raise two preliminary issues. First is who should frame a constitution of India ? It is necessary to raise this question because there are quite a lot of people in India who are hoping if not asking, the British Govt. to resolve the deadlock and to frame a constitution for India. In think there is a gross falacy in such a view which needs to be exposed. A constitution framed by the British Govt. and imposed upon Indians, sufficed in the past. But if the nature of the future constitution Indians are clamouring for, is borne in mind it will be clear that an imposed constitution will not do.

"The difference between the past constitution and future constitution of India is fundamental, and those, who still rely on the British for framing a constitution for India, do not seem to have realised this difference. The difference lies in this that the past constitutions contained a breakdown clause. People in Indian decry the breakdown clause by now the notorious section 93 of the Govt. of India act 1935. That is because they do not know the why and the how of its place in the act.

Its importance will become apparent if two important considerations governing the political life of a community are borne in mind. First of these considerations is that Law and order is the medicine of the body politic, and when the body politic goes sick this medicine must be administered. Indeed so important is this consideration that failure to administer it must be deemed to be a crime against a society and civilisation. The second consideration is that though it is true that no Govt. has a vested right to govern, it is equally true that there must always be a government to govern - which I mean maintain law and order - until it is displaced by a

better Govt. The breakdown clause serves these two purposes. As such it is of the highest value for the peace and tranquility of the people. It is the one and only means which can save the country from anarchy. For when the constitutional Govt. fails, the break down clause has at least the merit of maintaining the Govt.

"In the past this distinction between constitutional Govt. and Govt. with the provision for Govt. stepping in when constitutional Govt. failed, was a feasible proposition. It was feasible because while the British Govt. gave Indians the right to a constitutional Govt., it kept to itself the right to govern, should constitutional Govt. fail. In the future constitution of India, it would not be possible to maintain this distinction. It would not be possible for the British Govt. to give the Indians the right to constitutional Govt. and also to keep to itself the right to Govern in case there was breakdown in the constitutional Govt. The reason is quite obvious. The past constitutions of India did not treat Indian as a Dominion. The future constitution will proceed on the assumption that India will be a dominion. The breakdown clause or the possibility of Government stepping in, when constitutional Govt. has failed can be reconciled in the case of a country, which has no Dominion status. But the two are irreconcilable in the case of a Dominion. In the case of a Dominion or for the matter of that in the case of any free country, there is either a constitutional Govt. or a rebellion."

Now reader is requested to go through page No. 403 in Shourie's book and read the meaning drawn by Shourie on breakdown clause. Whereby he interprets that Dr. Ambedkar refused the need for constituent assembly because it would abolish the Breakdown clause - Section 93 of Govt. of India act 1935, which permits British to step in, in case of failure of provincial administration. Actually Dr. Ambedkar was explaining the difference in constitution between a British India & independant India & also explaining how Breakdown clause is useless in constitution of independant India. Will

any one believe that this man knows English ? Will anyone believe he is columnist in English News Paper ? Will any one believe that this man is capable of drawing correct meaning. The answer is 'No'. This is what I want to convey to the readers that Shourie has lost the faculty of reading English and construing right interpretation. There are N'number of examples like this. And hence whatever conclusions he has drawn are not to be believed.

Writer was hurt when Dr. Ambedkar quoted about bribery case in scottish parliament. Shourie denounced Dr. Ambedkar by saying that "this is the opinion of Ambedkar about his own country men." Actually it is not challenging or doubting morals of the people. He was narrating the facts that happened in the history of scotland; which may happen in any part of the world. There is no question of believing or not believing our own people. Moreover his suspicion that Bribery may prevail in political life is a front page story in all news papers of today. For example trial against our Ex. Prime Minister Mr. P.V. Narsimharao and Zarkhand Mukti Morcha MPS Mr. Sheilendra Mahanto & Shiboo Soren. Does this not prove his foresight about human behaviour ?

A similar misinterpret is given by shourie on page 412, where he writes "From these propositions Ambedkar derived his scheme for the constitution of India, the method of governing the country and for solving the communal problem and his scheme for the constitution of India was to reserve seats for caste Hindus Muslims and scheduled casts in equal proportion at all levels and in all branches of the state, and to constitute a structure in which none would dominate the other."

To know the real state of affair, reader has no option but to read original from Dr. Ambedkar's writings in 'Communal deadlock and a way to solve it.'

PROPOSALS FOR SOLUTION OF THE COMMUNAL PROBLEM

"Having made my position clear on certain preliminary points, I will now proceed to deal with the subject.

The communal problem raises three questions :

- A) The question of representation in the legislature.
- B) the question of representation in the executive, and
- C) The question of representation in the services.

A) Representation in Public Service :-

To take the last question first. This can hardly be said to be a subject of controversy. The principle that all communities should be represented in the Public Services in a prescribed proportion and no single community should be allowed to have a monopoly has been accepted by the Govt. of India. This principle has been embodied in the Govt. of India resolutions of 1934 & 1943 and rules to carry it out have been laid down. It has even prescribed that any appointment made contrary to the rules shall be deemed Null and void. All that is necessary is to convert administrative practice into statutory obligation. This can be done by adding a schedule to the Govt. of India act which will include the provisions contained in these resolutions and similar provisions for the different provinces and make the schedule a part of the law of the constitution.

B) Representation in the Executive :-

This question raises three points.

- 1) The quantum of representation in the executive
- 2) The nature of the executive
- 3) The method of filling the places in the executive

(i) Quantum of representation :-

For the solution of this question, the principle which should be adopted is that the representation of the Hindus, the Muslims

and the scheduled castes should be equal to the quantum of their representation in the legislature. With regard to the other minorities such as the sikhs, Indian- Christians and Anglo-Indians, it is difficult to give them representation in the executive in strict proportion to their representation in the legislature. This difficulty arises from the smallness of their numbers. If they are to get representation in the executive in strict proportion to their numbers the executive would have to be enlarged to a fantastic degree. All that that can be done therefore, is to reserve a seat or two for them in the cabinet for their representation and to establish a convention that they will get a fair proportion in the crops of parliamentary secretaries that will have to be raised, when the new constitution comes into existence. Shourie has mislead the readers on this point too.

C) Representation in the Legislature :-

This is the most difficult question. All other questions depend upon the solution of this question. It raises two points :

- i) Quantum of representation
- ii) The nature of electorate

Quantum of representation :-

He has given proposed ratio of representation in the various provinces depending upon the census figures. Here we will illustrate an example of central assembly only.

Community	% of total Population	% of representation
Hindus	54.68	40
Muslims	28.50	32
Scheduled Castes	14.30	20
Indian Christians	1.16	3
Sikhs	1.49	4
Anglo-Indians	0.05	1

And this percentage of communities differed in different states depending upon the communities population in that province. This is not exactly what Shourie has shown, where he says "His scheme for the constitution of India was to reserve seats for caste Hindus, Muslims & scheduled castes in equal proportion. But what Dr. Ambedkar wants to say is "Representation of Hindus, Muslims and the scheduled castes equal to the quantum of their representation in the legislature. And these two statements carry different meaning. Again intension of shourie is to arouse the emotions of Caste Hindus against Dr. Ambedkar. At places he goes on narrating the book "Communal deadlock and way to solve it.", as if he is giving running commentary. He neither criticises nor appreciates it. Terminally he again criticises Dr. Ambedkar Shourie does not believe that the scheme given by Dr. Ambedkar was to prevent Pakistan and hence he criticises Dr. Ambedkar baselessly. Scheme given by Dr. Ambedkar may not be full proof as per shourie. But then he should have made an attempt to prove him wrong, but shourie does only on thing and that is criticism without reasoning.

In this regard Dr. Ambedkar said "My proposals are for an United India. They are made in the hope that the Muslims will accept them in preference to Pakistan as providing better security than Pakistan does..... I claim that my plan is better than the plan of Pakistan. Let me state the points which tell in favour of my plan. They are :

- 1) Under my proposal the danger of communal majority, which is the basis of pakistan is removed.
- 2) Under my proposal the weightage at present enjoyed by the Muslims is not disturbed.
- 3) The position of Muslims in the Non Pakistan provinces is greatly strengthened by an increase in their representation, which they may not get, if pakistan comes & which will leave them in a more helpless condition than they are at present.

Instead of challenging these points scientifically, Shourie is beating round the Bush and patting his own back. Instead of praising Dr. Ambedkar for his sincere efforts to avert Pakistan Shourie is criticising him without any base. This is where Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya is proved to be right.

*"Opposition to the partition of India by fanatic Hindus was meaning less, because fanatic Hinduism was one of the cause for partition."*⁸⁴

*"One thing should be clearly understood., Claimant of United India that is today's Jansangh and previous supporters of distorted Hinduism, both these have actually helped the British and Muslim League for Partition. What ever may be there in their mind they have not attempted any thing to make Muslims stay with Hindus in this country. What they did is to increase the discord betwee the two parties."*⁸⁵

STATE SOCIALISM

Socialism is the domain of those who care for common masses, who are concerned about poor people. In contrast Capitalists are the people who are more concerned about profits and gains of business class people, rich people. Difficulties and sufferings of poor people do not mean anything to these capitalist mentality. Shourie belonging to this group, how can he tolerate the socialistic thoughts of Dr. Ambedkar ? Dr. Ambedkar not only proclaimed socialist principles, but also planned a strategy to uplift poor people to bring economic equality. Any person who has little concern for the poor masses will agree word to word what Dr. Ambedkar has said in his book "States and Minorities". For protection against economic exploitation Dr. Ambedkar writes :

"The United States of India shall declare as a part of the law of its constitution -

84, 85. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya : Bhartiya Falniche Gunhegar, P-2

- 1) The industries which are key industries or which may be declared to be key industries shall be owned and run by the state.
- 2) The industries which are not key industries but which are basic industries shall be owned by the state and shall be run by the state or by corporations established by the state.
- 3) That, Insurance shall be a monopoly of the state and that the state shall compell every adult citizen to take out a life Insurance Policy commensurate with his wages as may be prescribed by the legislature.
- 4) That agriculture shall be state industry.
- 5) That state shall acquire the subsisting rights in such Industries, Insurance and agricultural land held by private individuals, whether as owners, tenants or mortgages and pay them compensation in the form of debenture equal to the value of his or her right in the land. Provided that in reconing the value of land, plant or security no account shall be taken of any rise therein due to emmergency of any potential or unearned value or any value for compulsory acquisition.
- 6) The state shall determine how and when the debenture holder shall be entitled to claim cash payment.
- 7) The debenture shall be transferrable and inheritable property but neither the debenture holder nor the transferee from the original holder nor his heir shall be entitled to claim the return of the land or interest in any industrial concern, acquired by the state or will be entitled to deal it in any way.
- 8) The debenture holder shall be entitled to interest on his debenture at such rate as may be defind by law to be paid by the state in cash or kind as the state may deem fit.

- 9) Agricultural industry shall be organised on the following basis :
- i) The state shall divide the land acquired into farms of standard size and let out the farms for cultivation to residents of villages as tenants (made up of group of families) to cultivate on the following conditions.
 - a) The farm shall be cultivated as a collective farm.
 - b) The farm shall be cultivated in accordance with rules and direction issued by Govt.
 - c) The tenants shall share among themselves in the manner prescribed the produce of the farm left after the payment of charges properly levied on the farm.
 - ii) The land shall be let out to villagers without distinction of caste or creed and in such a manner that there will be no land lord, no tenants and no landless labourer.
 - iii) It shall be the obligation of state to finance the cultivation of the collective farms by supply of water, draft, animals, implements, manure seeds etc.
 - iv) The state shall be entitled to ;
 - a) To levy the following charges on the produce of the farm
 - i) a portion for land revenue
 - ii) a portion to pay the debenture holder
 - iii) a portion to pay for the use of capital goods supplied and
 - b) To prescribe penalties against tenants who break the conditions of tenancy or willfully neglect to make the best use of the means of cultivation offered by the state or other wise act prejudicially to the scheme of collective farming.
- 10) The scheme shall be brought into operation as early as possible but in no case shall the period extend beyond the tenth year from the date of the constitution coming into operation.

Any person having concern for masses, concern for poor would not find any doubt principally., at least. But Shourie, who is sitting to safe guard the interest of rich, industrialists, capitalists land lords could not tolerate this scheme even for 10 years. How can he ? This scheme would have removed teeths of Land lords and capitalists to bite the labour class. Here again Shourie criticises Dr. Ambedkar's scheme, without giving any scientific or logical reasoning. His only criticism is "What experience Dr. Ambedkar has in running an industrial unit or a farm". the same question can be asked to Shourie, as to what experience he has when he denies the scheme. When the constituent assembly (full of rich & Baniyas) did not accept Dr. Ambedkar's proposal, Shourie signed with relief saying "But to the good fortune of the country - really speaking for the good fortune of baniyas and land lords - in this regard as in every other reagrd the Constituent Assembly did not adopt Ambedkar's proposal."⁸⁶

It would be interesting to know the opinion of research scholars Dr. K. Gopal Dr. Jagdish Lal and Sabarjeet S. Sharma given in their objective study-cun-research document.⁸⁷

"In other words, Ambedkar sought active involvement of the Govt. in economic development without the Marxian totalitatianism and state monopoly. In the above mentioned book, Ambedkar has advocated state ownership of agricultural land with a democratic collectivised method of cultivation and limited control of industries (i.e. heavy industries and large public utilities). Ambedkar's concept, of state socialism is based on three basic tenets ;

- i) State ownership of agricultural land and key industries to meet the demands of the poor strata of society
- ii) Maintainance of productive resources by the state, and

86. Dr. K. Gopal, Dr. J. Lal & S.S. Sharma : *'Thoughts & Ideas of Gandhi, Nehru, Tagore And Ambedkar*, P-222.

87. Arun Shourie : *'Worshipping False Gods'* P-431.

iii) a just distribution of the common produce among the different people without any distinction of castes or creed.

Ambedkar perceived an active but well-defined role for the state in the economic affairs of the country. He did not favour imposition of arbitrary restraint on the economic processes. He was not prepared to forsake individual incentive for the economic welfare. Given the recent developments in Soviet Union, China and East-European countries, especially their move towards greater accent on individual incentives, Ambedkar's apprehensions regarding the evils of totalitarianism have indeed turned out to be almost prophetic."

The explanation given by Dr. Ambedkar reasons to logic. "The main purpose behind the clause is to put an obligation on the state to plan the economic life of the people on the lines which would lead to highest point of productivity without closing every avenue to private enterprise and also provide for the equitable distribution of wealth..... It places squarely on the shoulders of the state the obligation to supply capital necessary for agriculture as well as industry. Without the supply of capital by the state neither land nor industry can be made to yield better results. It proposes to nationalise insurance with double objective. Nationalised insurance gives the individual greater security than private insurance firm, does, as it pledges the resources of the state as a security for the ultimate payment of his insurance money. It also gives the state the resources necessary for financing its economic planning in the absence of which it would have to resort to borrowing from the money market at a high rate of interest. State socialism is essential for rapid industrialisation of India. Private enterprise cannot do it and if it did it would produce those inequalities of wealth which capitalism has produced in Europe and which should be warning to Indians....."

Political Democracy rests on four premises which may be set out in the following manner.

i) The individual is an end in himself.

- ii) That the individual has certain inalienable rights which must be guranted to him by the constitution.
- iii) That the individual shall not be required to relinquish any of his constitutional rights as a condition precedent to the receipt of a previlage,
- iv) That the state shall not delegate powers to private persons to govern others.

Anyone who studies the working of the system of social economy based on private enterprise & pursuit of personal gain will realise how it undermines, if it does not actually voilate the last two premises on which democracy rests. How many have to subject themselves to be governed by private employers ?

Ask those who are unemployed whether what are called fundamental rights are of any value to them. If a peson is unemployed is offered a choice between a job of some sort, with some sort of wages with no fixed hours of labour and with an interdict of joining a union & the exercise of his right to freedom of speech, association, religion etc. can there be any doubt as to what his choice will be"

Critics of state socialism even its friends are bound to ask why make it a part of the constitutional law of the land. Why not leave it to be legislature to bring it into being by the ordinary process of law. The reason why it cant be left to the ordinary law is not difficult to understand. One essential condition for the success of planned economy is that it must not be liable to suspension or abandonment. It must be permanent. The question is how this permanence can be sucured. Obviously it cannot be secured under the form of Govt. called parliamentary democracy. Under the system of Parliamentary Democracy, the policy of legislature and of the executive, is the policy of the majority for the time being. Under the system of parliamentary democracy the majority in one election may be in favour of state socialism in Industry and in Agriculture. At the next election the majority may be against it. The anti-state socialism majority will use its

law making power to undoing the work of the Pro-state socialism majority and the pro state socialism majority will use its law making power to doing over again what has been undone by their opponents, Those who want the economic structure of society to be modelled on state socialism must realise that they cannot leave the fulfilment of so fundamental a purpose to the exigencies of the ordinary law which simple majorities - whose political fortunes are never determined by rational causes - have a right to make and unmake. For these reasons political democracy seems to be unsuited for the purpose.

What is alternative ? The alternative is Dictatorship. There is no doubt that dictatorship can give permanence which state socialism requires as an essential condition for its fructification. There is however one fact against dictatorship which must be faced. Those who believe in individual freedom strongly object the dictatorship and insist upon Parliamentary democracy as a proper form of Govt. for a free society. For they feel that freedom of the individual is possible only under the parliamentary democracy and not under dictatorship. Consequently those who want freedom are not prepared to give up Parliamentary democracy as a form of Govt. However, much they may be anxious to have a state socialism.,they will not be ready to exchange Parliamentary Democracy for dictatorship eventhough the gain by such an exchange is the achievement of state socialism. The problem therefore is to have state socialism without dictatorship, to have state socialism with parliamentary democracy and to prescribe state socialism by the law of constitution so that it will be beyond the reach of Parliamentary majority to suspend amend or abrogate it. It is only by this that one can achieve the triple object namely to establish socialism retain Parliamentary Democracy and avoid dictatorship.

..... Those who want socialism with parliamentary democracy and without dictatorship should welcome the proposal.....⁸⁸

88. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar : *'Writing and Speeches'*, Govt. of Maharashtra Publication, Vol. I, P. 411-412.

How logical, how perfectly suited for democracy, were the thoughts of Dr. Ambedkar. No other contemporary has given us such an exhaustive analysis of Parliamentary democracy, socialism and dictatorship. But it is the misfortune of this country that many of his proposals, which would have been highly beneficial for the country in the long run, were rejected by the "Nationalist Leaders" merely because they could not think ahead of time or the lobbies sitting for safeguarding the interests of Baniyas and rich people did not want this avalanche of calamities, showering on their communities.

So really speaking not a single claim of Mr. Shourie has any matter worth mentioning. He tried to achieve the meaning he wanted, only by distorting the sentences, distorting the meaning, concluding from the statements of Dr. Ambedkar without taking any cognisance of reference or context, and thus landing on the wrong meaning. For example Shourie has brought two different statements of Dr. Ambedkar together, which were uttered by Dr. Ambedkar in an altogether different reference and context. Shourie has cunningly brought them together. For example regarding constitution at one end it is a "Wonderful document" and at the other end "ought to be burnt". He has categorically stated why he wanted to burn the constitution. He said, 'if someone constructs a temple with an intention of installing god in the temple and suddenly a demon occupies the temple the sole purpose is lost. He means the temple of constitution was constructed for growth of equality, fraternity and liberty. But unfortunately these principles appear on the paper and have not percolated in actual life, in society & hence inequality in social & economical life is a threat to constitution. - I don't believe that Shourie does not understand this - Ambedkar has warned the people of India against such contradiction in life. He has also guided the Leaders of Political Parties as to what course they need to take to keep the integrity of the nation intact (Which no

other national leader has done). If inspite of this someone challenges Dr. Ambedkar as a constitution maker or as a National leader then possibly that individual has lost his faculty of thinking and reasoning. He is denying that facts well evident, well accepted and that individual is possibly in the state of Delusions.



OBSERVATIONS & CONCLUSIONS

1. "Quit India" movement so highly illustrated by writer was a poorly organised "Mob Agitation". It did not culminate into the Independence of India. Other factors have contributed for it.
2. Sikhs, Muslims, Anglo-Indians, Untouchables, Christians, Communists did not join this movement. Stalwarts like Rajaji, Veer Sawarkar, S.P. Mukharjee, Golwarkar Guruji did not believe in "Quit India" movement.
3. Mr. M.G. Ranade, Agarkar and other Social Reform Group people strongly believed that social and economical freedom should come prior to the political freedom. Dr. Ambedkar belonged to this school of thought.
4. Dr. Ambedkar is criticised for his joining the executive council of Vice Roy. But there were other Indians in the council. Pandit Nehru and Maulana Azad were willing to join the Executive Council. Pandit Nehru was ready to co-operate British even without any promise from them regarding Independence.

*Role of Dr. Ambedkar during arrest of Mahatma Gandhi, is darkly painted by Shourie, as a villain. This is nothing but an emotional Black-Mail. Strategy about arrest was ready even before Dr. Ambedkar joined the council.

5. Unconditional support of Dr. Ambedkar and his party to 'Friends Alliance' in the early part of war, his help in the War front, his persuasions of communists of India & Russia, His speeches and articles in those period, figures him

out as an International personality on the International Convass, and his joining the Executive council proves to be valid and in order.

*His work in the Executive council regarding Damodar Valley Scheme, Orissa River Development Scheme, His concern for coal mine workers and his work for those people is nothing but a social service, a service to the Nation.

6. With all regards to Mr. Gandhi for his role in the Independance of this country, His role in the emancipation of untouchables was very superflous, self adorning and for the betterment of congress, leaving the untouchables to the mercy ? of High Caste Hindus. He snatched the political armour of untouchables in Poona pact and left them unguarded. So all the wrath and criticism done by Dr. Ambedkar is valid.

7. 1937 Elections : Election Analysis pur forward by Dr. Ambedkar is scientific and logical. He has disproved the Congress claim of representating the untouchables. Shourie without bothering for the analysis pur forward by Dr. Ambedkar has played the role of 'Drummer' of Congress.

8. Deliverance Day : Shourie has tried to tarnish the image of Dr. Ambedkar by suppressing the facts behind celebrations of deliverance Day. Facts are explained in this book.

9. Minority Treaty : Was neither created by Dr. Ambedkar nor he recommended it. Shourie has presented it that way, by drawing wrong conclusions.

10. British Agent : Shourie has cunningly illustrated some part of Dr. Ambedkar's writing in vol. IX, titled 'False Charge' but omitted the last paragraph of the essay, which alters the meaning drastically. Thus by suppressing the fact, he is painting Dr. Ambedkar as British agent. However Dr. Ambedkar's speech in R.T.C. is a strong answer to those

who call him British Agent. -Break down clause is interpreted by Shourie, in his own way; & it is not the meaning & intension of Dr. Ambedkar.

11. On the other hand congress and Mr. Gandhi left no stone unturned to finish up the political life of Dr. Ambedkar. They snatched his hard earned "Separate Electorate" a political armour of untouchables.

12. There is reason to believe that the deep seated conspiracy compelled Dr. Ambedkar to abandon his fast growing "Independant Labour Party" and start 'Scheduled caste Federation."

13. Inspite of all this 'Ill Treatment' Dr. Ambedkar accepted to co-operate the Congress, in constitution making and given a Lions Share in it. Worked day and Night without bothering for his failing health. He advised the political parties and future leaders of the nation and about Do's and Dont's to keep the integrity of this country intact. He tried to bring improvement in the Hindu society by eliminating bad things, in the Hindu Code Bill.

14. So, If I say that Dr. Ambedkar is the brightest Star shining in the Galaxy of Indian Heros, who has a courage to contradict it ?

YES MR. SHOURIE !

Hard luck this time. Try again.



B-1596

" Will history repeat itself ? It is this thought which fills me with anxiety. This anxiety is deepened by the realisation of the fact that in addition to our old enemies in the form of castes and creeds we are going to have many political parties with diverse and opposing political creeds. Will Indians place the country above their creed or will they place creed above country ? I do not know. But this much is certain that if the parties place creed above country, our independence will be put in jeopardy a second time and probably be lost for ever. This eventuality we must all resolutely guard against. We must be determined to defend our independence with the last drop of our blood."

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar